THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*
A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 5. AUGUST, 1925. Vol. XV.

THE PROSPECTS OF REUNION

By the Rev. W. B. Selbie, D.D., Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford.

THE movement for the reunion of Christendom has now reached a stage at which it may be profitable to pause and take stock. So much has happened, especially during the last five years, that it is now possible to see the whole situation in a tolerably clear perspective and to form some adequate judgment of the grounds of hope for the future and of the difficulties that have yet to be faced. Not the least of these difficulties is the fact that the movement is proceeding not as a uniform whole, but in a thoroughly piecemeal and haphazard fashion. It may please us sometimes to sing 'Like a mighty army moves the Church of God,' but the words are a mere travesty of the truth. The Church never moves in this way, and where the question of unity is concerned, perhaps less so than ever. At the same time the varied and sporadic attempts at reunion which are being made all over the world do at least indicate a concern in the matter and a spirit of goodwill which are real grounds of hope.

It may be well, therefore, before we go further, to mention very briefly some of the more important steps which have been and are being taken to bring together some of the now divided members of the body of Christ. First, we would put the Lambeth Conferences between representative Anglicans and Free Churchmen, which have been held during the last four years as the result of the great Lambeth appeal to all Christian people, put forth in the year 1920. These conferences have been characterized by the utmost frankness and friendliness,

and have resulted in a much larger measure of agreement than, at their inception, would have been thought possible. They have also brought into clear relief the outstanding points of difference, and have helped each side to grasp more fully and sympathetically the position of the other. For the moment they are in abeyance, but there can be no doubt that they have cleared the air, and perhaps even opened the way for yet further advance. Side by side with these have gone various conferences in this country and America in preparation for the 'World Conference on Faith and Order' which is projected a few years hence. Here again has been indicated a very marked agreement, especially on doctrinal questions. The whole ground has been thoroughly explored, and the limits and possibilities of further conference on a wider scale have been set forth. Whenever the World Conference meets it will at least have all the facts before it, and that in a form which should make it possible to use them intelligently and to some good effect. Meanwhile, certain parties in the Anglican Church have been looking wistfully to the Roman and Eastern Churches and tentatively exploring the possibilities of a better understanding. It is not yet known whether the Malines conversations, as they are called, are likely to produce any definite result. The Anglo-Catholics seem to be hopeful, but it must be said that Protestants generally view both their actions and their hopes in this direction with little sympathy and much suspicion. Their approaches to the Eastern Church are perhaps more within the range of practical politics, but cannot as yet be regarded as more than a fine gesture on both sides. A much more hopeful situation is that presented by the South India United Church. The problem in the Mission Field is, no doubt, very different from that at home. But the urgency of the need for Union is more strongly felt there, and it may be that, under the providence of God, the Mission Field is destined to show the way of advance to the home Churches in this as well as in other respects.

Meanwhile a good deal of progress has been made in the direction of closer union among the various branches of the Free Churches in different parts of the world. In Canada the United Church of Canada is now an established fact. It consists of a union of the Methodist, Congregationalist and Pres-

byterian Churches into one compact body, and the scheme of union on which it is based deserves careful study in view of similar movements elsewhere. Unfortunately, there is a dissenting minority consisting mainly of Presbyterians, which mars the completeness of the whole, and vividly illustrates the strength of the prejudices which have to be faced. In this country Methodist union is gradually becoming an accomplished fact. The three great Methodist bodies have voted in its favour by very large majorities and, though the further negotiations may take time and will require much patience and self-sacrifice, it appears almost certain that the end desired will ultimately be reached, to the great credit and advantage of all concerned. The question is often asked, especially in Anglican circles, why the Free Churches of this country do not unite more closely among themselves before seeking any wider union. It should be remembered, however, that relations between these Churches are much closer than they used to be, and they feel that they are already one in the only sense that really matters. In addition to a large measure of doctrinal agreement, they have a complete mutual understanding resulting in free interchange of pulpits, intercommunion, and an almost entire cessation of the old overlapping and rivalry. In the Free Church Council and the Federal Council of the Free Churches they can show a united front to the world, while the several constituent bodies retain their autonomy and are free to develop along the lines of their individual genius and traditions. They must not be blamed if they regard this type of unity as preferable to any rigid uniformity, and if they see in it the ideal which they would prefer to pursue in their relations with other Churches. How possible and fruitful such relations might become is seen in such a movement as that known as C.O.P.E.C., and in the innumerable joint associations of Churches which led up to that movement and made it possible. The net result of this rapid and necessarily incomplete survey would seem to be that the case for a reunited Christendom is generally conceded, but that there is as yet no definite agreement as to the form which it should take. It is probably the case that Anglicans require something much more rigid, organized and uniform than Free Churchmen, as at present advised, are prepared to concede.

A further difficulty has to be reckoned with in the fact that the rank and file on both sides are not yet educated up to the level which has been reached by the leaders. Those who have had the privilege of sharing in the many conferences which have taken place during the last decade or more have had many of their opinions profoundly changed. They have discovered a most impressive agreement in Christian thought and feeling with those from whom they differ most widely in other ways. In consequence, they have come to view the whole situation in a truer perspective, and to deal with their opponents in a more sympathetic spirit. On both sides, too, there has grown up an increased respect for the conscientious scruples of others, and therefore a desire to avoid fine sounding phrases of agreement which only serve to conceal differences. But it has been a great gain to discover what the exact points of difference are, even if this has led to the conviction that on our present information they appear to be quite irreconcilable. This conviction, however, has not caused those concerned to wish to abandon their quest. They have discovered so much real and vital unity existing among Christians of very different traditions and outlook that they cannot easily give up the hope of finding for this unity some more definite and practical expression.

Among the rank and file, however, the position is very different. Most of the Churches are preoccupied with their own problems, and are finding the struggle for existence enough to engage all their energies. They feel that experience has amply justified their existence, and they are conscious of good work done for the Kingdom of God. They cling closely to their evangelical traditions, and the present trend of things makes them feel all the more strongly the necessity for maintaining these traditions at all costs. It is but the simple truth to say that they do not see themselves as erring and contumacious children who need to be convinced of their waywardness and brought back to the arms of the mother whom they have deserted. They believe that their work has been acknowledged and blessed by the Spirit of God, and that they are therefore the repositories of a trust to which they cannot be unfaithful. They are ready to work heartily with all those who are seeking the ends of God's Kingdom. They long for greater unity with their brethren in all the churches. They are ready to make

sacrifices in order to secure it. But they feel that they ought not to be asked to repudiate their past or to enter on any scheme of union which would threaten that liberty in the Gospel for which they fought and in which they stand. Therefore they cherish the ideal of a unity of the Spirit which would best express itself in a federation of Churches each having its distinctive genius and free to develop on its own lines. They believe there is much to be gained by variety of type, and they are not inclined to surrender it in favour of any rigid uniformity. Further, they have to confess to a certain sense of disappointment that the fair words of the Anglicans have not been followed up in action. The Lambeth Appeal came upon them as a great and welcome surprise. They took at their face value the memorable words, 'We acknowledge all those who believe in Our Lord Jesus Christ and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ which is His Body.' These words seemed to them to represent an entire change of attitude on the part of the Anglican authorities, and the average Free Churchman, rather innocently perhaps, assumed that this change would soon find practical expression. As time has gone on, and it has become increasingly evident that there is no hope of union with the Anglican Church save on the basis of a universal episcopate and the reordination of his ministers, the ordinary man in the pew may be pardoned if he feels himself somewhat disillusioned. Terms like 'a constitutional episcopate' and 'a commission through episcopal ordination,' however important for purposes of negotiation, mean little or nothing to him. He judges by what he sees, and to him the most conspicuous thing about the Anglican Church in these days is the growing assertiveness of the Anglo-Catholics, and the apparent acquiescence of the authorities in their actions and claims. He is beginning, therefore, to ask what kind of a Church is it with which he is to unite. Is it to be Catholic or Protestant, and how far is he expected to go in making concessions in order to obtain a union which, as far as he can see, is likely to be a very one-sided affair? In all this he is perhaps a little unreasonable and too much at the mercy of his fears and prejudices. But his frame of mind is one that has to be reckoned with. No doubt much the same temper can be found

mutatis mutandis among the rank and file of the Anglican Church. We are credibly informed that among the Anglican laity there is no enthusiasm for reunion, except perhaps in the case of some of the younger men and women, mostly of the student class. On the other hand, there is on the part of many a good deal of suspicion of episcopal overtures to Dissenters. Why not let well alone and if we want to unite with anyone let it be with the Eastern or Roman Churches, where our true affinities lie? After all the Dissenters cut themselves off, and can have reunion to-morrow if they want it by returning to their allegiance to the Mother Church. This is undoubtedly a very general and not unreasonable attitude on the Anglican side.

All this gives one furiously to think. It should be quite evident that no reunion worth the name can come about by being imposed from above. It must be the outcome of definite conviction and enthusiasm on the part of the majority of those concerned. Therefore the immediate and most hopeful duty for the moment would seem to be to enter on a definite educational campaign in which both sides might be instructed in the real meaning of and need for unity. If as a preliminary the leaders on both sides would agree as to the kind of unity they want and are aiming at, so much the better. But in any event, the case for unity has yet to be stated. It should be based not on merely sentimental considerations, or on sayings of Our Lord of doubtful authenticity, but on the very nature and genius of the Christian faith. If we believe, as we continually sing, that 'The Church's one foundation is Jesus Christ her Lord,' then let us build on that foundation and on that alone. For if the central and vital thing in Christianity is Jesus Christ and man's relation to Him, then all doctrinal and ecclesiastical considerations fall into their proper place. They may be useful and even necessary means to the end, but they are not the end itself. Even as things are men of different creeds and Churches feel themselves one in their devotion to and experience of the Lord Jesus Christ, and those whom God hath thus joined together ought not to be put asunder. Here is the real principle of Christian unity, and it is compatible with a wide diversity of belief and practice. Such diversity in itself may be a natural and healthy thing, and a long experience has now convinced many, at least on the Free Church side, that it is

infinitely preferable to any uniformity. Discussions on reunion so far seem to have had as their object the setting up of a single uniform system of Church order, and have revealed the serious obstacles that have to be overcome before any such system is possible. While the parties concerned are marking time, might it not be well to explore afresh the limits of possible diversity and to discover how far differences in faith and order can be made compatible with a fundamental unity of life and practice?

We have already referred to the fact that many of the reunion conferences have revealed a surprising agreement on matters of faith, and it would probably not be impossible to get a majority in all the Churches to agree on a definite statement of Christian doctrine. But here, too, a new difficulty has begun to make itself felt. The portent known as fundamentalism, in spite of appearances, has in it more of tragedy than of comedy. It is born of panic and ignorance, and its appeal rests on the promise it gives of certitude. But so long as it dominates men's minds it will embitter their relations with all who differ from them and make anything like stable union impossible. Here again, then, the need for education is paramount. Lord Halifax has recently told us that 'the great question confronting Christians to-day is how to restore the broken unity of Christendom without sacrificing truth.' What he probably means is truth in the Catholic or Vincentian sense of '*Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus, creditum est.*' But there is a higher interpretation of truth than that, and there will be no real and abiding union among Christians until they are agreed to submit themselves to the guidance of the Spirit of truth who will lead them into all the truth, and take of the things of Christ and reveal them unto men. To believe that 'God hath still more light and truth to break forth from His word' is an essential element in the Christian standpoint and fundamental to Christian unity. Only in the light of it can dogma be anything else than a fissiparous force.

It is obvious therefore that the desire for reunion must produce a greater readiness on all sides to give and take than our discussions have as yet revealed. It is worse than useless to begin by tabling ultimatums, and laying down positions beyond which concession cannot go. We need to say to one another what Cromwell said to the Presbyterians of his day,

'Gentlemen think it possible that you may be mistaken.' We do not need to ask anyone to abandon principles or cherished convictions. But we do need to distinguish between principles and prejudices and to avoid investing adiaphora with the dignity of conscience. The need of the moment is a greater goodwill and a more open mind. We must go into conference not in a spirit of bargaining, but dominated by the splendid ideal of Christian charity, and determined to make the sacrifices necessary to secure our end. Only on such terms will it be possible to secure a union which is living, organic and fruitful in results.

It would appear, then, that the prospect of reunion, while obscure and doubtful, is by no means hopeless. But a great deal of spade work has yet to be done before it can come within the region of practical politics. The interchange of views which has already taken place has proved of the utmost value. It has cleared the air, removed many misunderstandings, and reduced the problem to more manageable proportions. But this has only been a beginning, and its effects have been confined to a few. The same process must be continued, but on a much wider scale, and it would prove infinitely more convincing and fruitful if it could be accompanied by united action of the kind that has already been attempted in many quarters. We must get to know one another much better than we do before we can hope to discover any common ground, and in exploring the whole situation afresh we need to keep our eyes fixed on the future rather than on the past. Above all, we must become convinced of the urgency of the problem, and leave no stone unturned to convince others. There is real need for earnest and intelligent propaganda in the cause of reunion, and if this can be carried out in a friendly and conciliatory spirit, and be accompanied by an increasing number of acts of union on all sides, we might reasonably hope for a successful issue in the not too distant future. The late Bishop of Oxford, in one of the last articles he wrote before his lamented death, strongly urged this policy of education and co-operation, and summed up the situation in the following words:

> 'After our time, if we have done our work well, our successors will be in a better position to decide the question which after all is the most fundamental of all, namely, are we or are we not mistaken

in trying to represent a spiritual fellowship of all Christians in terms of a highly organized visible Church.'

Meanwhile, our greatest ground of hope is in the new spirit which has been engendered. Lambeth has not spoken in vain. Friendly intercourse is now more frequent, and co-operation in social service and theological scholarship is doing its work, and resulting in nothing but good. Let us continue on these lines, and the way to some deeper and wider union will gradually open out.

THE COUNCIL OF NICAEA

By the Rev. ALFRED FAWKES, M.A., author of *Studies in Modernism.*

1. The present year is the Sixteenth Centenary of the First Oecumenical Council, that of Nicaea, 325. Its fifteen previous Centenaries seem to have passed unnoticed; and motives of ecclesiastical policy are perhaps not wholly foreign to the commemorative services which have been held in this country. There has been a wish to fraternize with and to obtain the recognition of the venerable Churches of the East; to emphasize episcopacy; to accentuate the traditional and historical side of religion. Many of us are under the mistaken impression that what is commonly called the Nicene Creed is that of the Council; in a time which, like our own, sits loose to institutional religion there is a disposition to return, in thought at least, to one whose perspective differed so widely from that of to-day; and, last, not least, the presence of a group of distinguished Oriental prelates gave a touch of colour to the scene.

2. It is difficult to transport ourselves in imagination back to the age of the Councils, and to conceive manners and ways of thinking differing so widely from our own. To-day, when our clerical assemblies meet, as they still do—some of us may think too often—it is without pomp or pretension. We do not speak of them as 'Holy' Synods, though they are more decorous than those which were formerly called so; nor do they close with damnatory clauses. Their members travel in modest vehicles, or perhaps on foot; little general interest is taken in

their discussions, which are often unreported in the Press. Then, it was very different: the highways were thronged by troops of bishops hurrying with their attendants to these synods; the public service of the posts, which was placed at their disposal, was disorganized by the transport required. Nor was the interest in their debates confined to the clergy. St. Gregory of Nyssa, speaking of Constantinople, says:

> 'This city is full of mechanics and slaves who are all professed theologians, and preach in the shops and the streets. Ask one of them to change you a coin, he will tell you wherein the Son and the Father differ; inquire the price of a loaf, you will be told that the Son is inferior to the Father; call for your bath, the answer is that the Son was made out of nothing.'

We live in another world.

3. The Councils were the outcome of the transformation of Christianity which took place in the second century. In becoming a World-Church, the religion of Christ was secularized, and its original Jewish atmosphere gave way to a Gentile; the belief in the Parousia, the imminent coming of the Lord, broke down. The spiritual gifts of the Apostolic age—healings, tongues, miracles—ceased; the prophetic ministry was replaced by the official; Enthusiasm, the distinctive note of the primitive communities, disappeared—the Christian was no longer 'in the Spirit'; he was subject to a hard, arbitrary and exacting legalism at the thought of which St. Paul would have turned in his grave. The process was a gradual one; the fourth century witnessed its completion: 'the age of religious freedom was terminated,' says the historian, 'with the Council of Nice,' Creeds and confessions of faith were imposed; mysteries which pass the human understanding were forced into formulas; 'the faith of the Christian trembled on the edge of a precipice where it was impossible to recede, perilous to halt, dreadful to fall.' Such reflections as these were not confined to later sceptics. The wisest and best men of the age anticipated them. 'Would that we were content with Scripture; then there could be no dispute,' says one. Another—'Let us not be wise beyond what is written.' A third, St. Hilary of Poitiers:

> 'We are driven to transgress the limits of our state; to scale the inaccessible; to name the nameless; to handle forbidden things.'

Are we not reminded of the English philosopher who, writing of 'insignificant—or meaningless—' speech, bids us—

> 'take a Schoole-man into our hands, and see if we can translate any one chapter, concerning any difficult point—as the Trinity, the Deity, the nature of Christ, Transubstantiation, Free-will, etc.—into any of the moderne tongues so as to make the same intelligible. When men write volumes of such stuffe, are they not mad (he asks), or intend to make others so?'

and—

> 'I should not say that he were in an Errour; but that his words were without meaning—that is to say Absurd.'[1]

A mania for Definition invaded Christendom. St. Hilary continues:

> 'There are as many creeds among us as there are opinions. The Homo-ousion'—*i.e.* the clause that declares the Son to be of one substance with the Father—'is rejected and received and explained away by successive synods; the partial, or total, resemblance between the Father and the Son is a subject of dispute in these unhappy times. Every year, every month, we make new creeds to describe invisible mysteries. Thus do we tear one another in pieces; thus are we the occasion each of his brother's fall.'

4. The Reformers of the sixteenth century appealed to the early Church, and took over much of the theology of the Councils. But our 21st Article reminds us that 'when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God), they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining to God.' And, says Cardinal Newman:

> 'If I avow my belief that freedom from symbols and articles is abstractedly the highest state of Christian communion, and the peculiar privilege of the Primitive Church, it is not from any tenderness towards that proud impatience of control in which many exult as in a virtue; but, first, because technicality and formalism are in their degree inevitable results of public confessions of faith; and next, because where confessions do not exist, the mysteries of divine faith, instead of being exposed to the gaze of the profane and uninstructed, are left hidden in the bosom of the Church.'[2]

Is there not a sense in which wise and good men, wherever and whenever found, are of one religion? For, to quote another such, a contemporary of Newman, and in many respects of another mind to his:

> 'It seems to be an opinion which is gaining ground among thoughtful and religious men that in theology the less we define the

[1] *Leviathan*, ch. viii.

[2] *Arians of the Fourth Century*, ch. i.

better. Definite statements respecting the relation of Christ either to God or man are only figures of speech; they do not really pierce the clouds that "round our little life." When we multiply words, we do not multiply ideas; we are still within the circle of our own mind. No greater calamity has ever befallen the Christian Church than the determination of some uncertain things which are beyond the sphere of human knowledge.'[3]

The Word was made flesh; but to set ourselves to define the manner of their union is not 'to be wise unto sobriety.' 'It is not in man's ability (says Hooker) to conceive the manner in which this is brought about.'

5. It is the custom of many to say, and no doubt of some to think, that the belief in the Divinity of Christ was established, or at least preserved, by the Councils of the fourth century—in particular by that of Nicaea; and the pious imagination pictures the assembled Fathers as awaiting a new Pentecost, a descent of the Spirit in which—

'The fires that rushed on Sinai down
In sudden torrents dread,
Now gently light, a glorious crown,
On every sainted head.'

Alas! sainted heads are rare. Here, as elsewhere, 'we have this treasure in earthen vessels'; the human element—passion, pride, prejudice, personal and party feeling came in; St. Ambrose confesses that the famous *Homo-ousion* was designed as a weapon of offence, not as a formula of concord. The phrase is seldom used by St. Athanasius; and it was insisted upon by the Roman Legates, who were rather party-managers than theologians, because it was one which, it was known, the opposition bishops would not accept. Both on historical and theological grounds it was viewed with suspicion; and 'was rather imposed than received.' Nor did it close the controversy. The result of the Council—

'was no more than a temporary truce, followed by a fratricidal war which split Christendom into conflicting sects, and when at last after sixty years of scandal it subsided, left as its legacy to future generations seeds of schism from which the Church suffers to this day.'[4]

The intervention of the civil power in the theological disputes of the age may seem incongruous to us: but, had it not been for the controlling hand of the State, the Church of the Fathers

[3] B. Jowett, Essay on 'Atonement and Satisfaction.'
[4] Duchesne, *Histoire ancienne de l'Eglise*, I, ch. iv.

would have suffered shipwreck—Caesar was the pilot who weathered the storm. The extent to which the *odium theologicum* was carried is all but incredible.

> 'Let those who divide Christ'—i.e. who assert His two Natures—'be divided, or sawn asunder; let them be cut to pieces; let them be burned alive.'

So shouted the zealous Alexandrians at Ephesus; and at Chalcedon they reiterated these pious aspirations:

> 'We said so then; and we say so now.'

The Pope of Alexandria—the title was not then confined to the Roman Bishop—kicked his brother Pope of Constantinople 'like a wild ass,' says a Greek historian, till the unfortunate man died of his injuries; the cry of the monks, headed by their abbot Barsumas, was 'Slay, slay.' Where is the Holy Ghost in all this? Can we think that the cause of God is entrusted to such men, or advanced by such methods? 'I am satisfied,' says Dr. Arnold, 'that Church authority, early or late, is as rotten a staff as ever was Pharaoh King of Egypt; it will go into a man's hand to pierce him.'[5] The moral argument, were there no other, would be conclusive. *Non in commotione Dominus;* the Lord is not in the tumult: in quietness and in confidence is our strength.

6. One Article asserts of General Councils, that—

> 'things ordained by them have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture.'

This is not the case with the Nicene formula, of which the most that can be said is that it is a construction put upon, or a conclusion deduced from, certain passages of Scripture—others being possible. In these high regions the path of the theologian is narrow, and skirts the abyss; an iota makes all the difference; here, it is believed, heaven opens—there hell yawns. It has been said by a humble worker in the mission field that those who desire to serve the Lord Jesus must often wonder whether they would not please Him more by saying less about Him. For we may speak much, yet say little. There would be fewer controversies among Christians were their Conferences and Congresses opened by the reading of the greatest of English sermons, that of Bishop Butler 'On the Ignorance of Man.' The instinct of the saints has taught them this. St. Athanasius

[5] *Life of Dr. Arnold*, by A. P. Stanley, p. 360. *Isaiah*, xxxvi. 6.

himself admits that when he meditated on the Divinity of the Logos, or Word, of God,

> 'his efforts recoiled upon themselves. The more he thought, the less he understood; and the more he wrote the more impossible he found it to put his thought into words.'

If it is otherwise with us, who speak so easily of these mysteries, is it not because we confine ourselves to the repetition of a formula without asking ourselves what the words mean?

7. Now, if this be so with the Doctors of the Church, and if the results of the dialectical process applied to theology are such as they describe, are not those who would force the thought of to-day into these categories without excuse? In the fourth century it was impossible not to think in them; they were those of the age. They are not those of ours; and, if we put new wine into them, the bottles will be broken and the wine spilled. It is no disparagement to the great men of the past—an Athanasius, an Augustine, an Aquinas—to take the time-and-place stuff which clings, and cannot but cling, to them for what it is: the lamp of truth is passed on from generation to generation with increase; knowledge grows. What do we really mean when we speak of the Divinity of Christ? Ah! if we could answer this question, we 'should know what God and man is'; all knowledge and all mysteries would be open before our eyes. It is not so.

> 'Think not thy wisdom can illume away
> The ancient tanglement of night and day;
> Enough to acknowledge both, and both revere:
> They see not clearliest who see all things clear.'

Is it not one of those great facts, which, like Time and Space, when we do not question them, we know; but of which, as soon as we raise questions concerning them, we are driven to confess our ignorance? Nor need we be ashamed to do so.

> 'Mankind is ignorant; a man am I:
> Call ignorance my sorrow, not my sin.'

Hence the essential fallacy of dogma, into which so large an element of human will and opinion enters.[6] In the ante-Nicene ages the dignity of Christ was measured by each according to the indefinite rule of Scripture, tradition, and reason; it was not stretched on a bed of Procrustes, and tortured into

[6] Marcellus of Ancyra, τὸ δόγματος ὄνομα τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ἔχεται βουλῆς τε καὶ γνώμης. Harnack takes these words as the motto of his *History of Dogma*.

a logical, or metaphysical, whole. There was no fixed formula; men spoke as the Spirit gave them utterance. The Church taught, but she did so in human accents—'as a man speaketh unto his friend.'[7] In that earlier age belief was not a burden; it was an emancipation of the mind, and an enlargement of the faculties. Can this be said to-day? Not till the question can be answered in the affirmative will the religious horizon be clear.

8. The essential truths of religion—and they are few—are rather a life to be lived than dogmas to be formulated. To live them is indeed difficult.

> 'How very hard it is to be
> A Christian!'

says Browning. But to formulate them, or to put them into syllogisms, is impossible; we are faced by a shibboleth which, endeavour as we will, we cannot frame to pronounce right. This is why an age of controversy is barren, because controversy is verbal rather than real; and words which 'are wise men's counters (they do but reckon by them) are the money of fools.'[8] The Trinitarian disputes passed over into the Christological; their character remained the same. *Triste siècle!* says Duchesne of the fifth century. It was one

> 'of decrepitude and ruin. The lessons of the fourth were lost upon it. Christians fought one another to the death for meaningless phrases; rather than yield on a question of words, they set East against West, Contantinople against Alexandria, and sacrificed the unity of Christendom to the susceptibilities of partisans. The unloosing of religious passions, rivalries between metropolitans, strife among bishops, turbulent councils, deprivations, exiles, riots, schisms—such were the conditions under which theologians argued over the unspeakable and unthinkable mysteries of God. With what result? The end of the long vista shows us the Eastern Church shattered to fragments, the Christian Empire dismembered, the lieutenants of Mahomet trampling Syria and Egypt under their feet. Such was the penalty which these metaphysical exercises entailed.'[9]

9. The Church bulks less now in public affairs than it did then; but the ties between the secular and the religious orders are still close and sensitive: the two act and react upon one another; the discredit of religion is the impoverishment of national life. We in England shall do well to remember this.

[7] *Ex.* xxxiii, 11.
[8] *Leviathan*, ch. iv.
[9] Duchesne, Vol. III, ch. x.

For in the Church of England to-day religion is weakened by a drift towards reaction the significance of which it would be foolish to underrate. Its strength, such as it is, is that of despair: the Church has lost the hold which it formerly had on the nation; and is falling back upon ecclesiasticism in hope of recovering it—on dogma and tradition, on liturgy and ritual: *any* port in a storm. Such a policy is a profoundly mistaken one; the way of recovery, if it is still open, is not here. No machinery which has not mind behind it will help us. The clerical and mixed bodies created by the recent Enabling Act have been discussing the Revision of the Prayer Book in great detail and at great length. No one will compare their proceedings to those of the Councils of the fourth and fifth centuries: the age is one of greater exterior civilization; such a comparison would be unjust. But now, as then, such assemblies are apt to think more highly of themselves than they ought to think; to usurp the style of an age which 'was in the Spirit,' and to proclaim 'it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us.' The association is open to question. The resolutions of such bodies carry the weight of the persons whose names are attached to them—neither more nor less. It is better to leave the Holy Ghost out of it: it is often far from clear where, or whether, He comes in. A Reunion, should such be possible, which would fill our empty churches, encourage persons of education to enter the ministry, and strengthen the historical union between Church and State, is to be desired. A Reunion which reverts to obsolete liturgies, revives disused ceremonial, and widens the gulf between the clerical and the lay mind, would be a disaster. We may be thankful that, in the last resort, it will rest with the nation as a whole in Parliament, not with a section of it in the Church Assembly or in Convocation, to decide whether the proposed Revision falls under the former or the latter head. May the decision be such as to preserve for us the National Church, not as theorists would have it, but as we have known it in fact, and as it presents itself to us in history—

> 'This ancient house of our fathers, with all its faults the best and most tolerant of the Churches of Christendom, and the least opposed to the spirit of the age.'[10]

[10] Jowett, *Miscellaneous Sermons*, p. 292.

COMMERCE AS PUBLIC SERVICE

A SERMON PREACHED IN WESTMINSTER ABBEY BEFORE THE NATIONAL CHAMBER OF TRADE.

By the Rev. B. H. STREETER, Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, Canon of Hereford.

Matt. vi, 10. Thy Kingdom come; Thy will be done, as in Heaven, so on earth.

AT the time when the words which I have just quoted were originally spoken the world of Western civilization formed a single great state—the Roman Empire. This state included, not only the whole of Europe west of the Rhine and south of the Danube, but those portions of Asia and Africa which adjoin the Mediterranean, the civilization, character and population of which have, since then, been entirely changed as a result of the Mahomedan conquest some seven centuries after the time of Christ.

Mr. H. G. Wells, in his *Outline of History*, describes the Roman Empire as 'a Neanderthal variety of the modern industrial state.' He means that in the Roman Empire there had already emerged (though in a far simpler form) those social and economic problems which necessarily come into existence where commerce and industry are developed on a world scale, and where Capital and Labour are organized in large concerns and over a wide area.

History never repeats itself exactly; but it would probably be true to say that the civilization of the Roman Empire differed very little from the civilization of modern Europe at the beginning of the last century, in so far as that civilization expressed itself in art and literature, in architecture and the general amenities of life, and in commercial activity—though in this last respect the analogy is not quite so close. The statesmen and writers of the eighteenth century looked at the best things in their own time, not as being any advance upon, but as a slowly-achieved revival of, the perished civilization of Rome; and in the main they were right in so doing. Their civilization *was* a revival and a renewal, after the centuries of darkness, barbarism and chaos which followed the collapse of Rome.

But what I am aiming at this morning is not a lecture on ancient history. I have reminded you of these facts only in order first to propound the question: What were the causes of

the decline and fall of Roman civilization? And then to go on to the further question: Can any lesson be drawn therefrom applicable to the economic difficulties of our own time?

The causes of the ruin of the civilization of antiquity have received considerable study from experts of recent years; and there is a pretty general agreement that the decay was due, partly to economic, partly to moral causes. Or perhaps I may put it in a better way by saying that the collapse of Rome was *on a surface view* mainly due to economic causes, but that it was by reason of the general moral decline that the economic problems were found insoluble. In other words, there was not enough goodwill, there was not enough honesty, there was not enough genuine interest in good work well done, there was not enough hard thinking; and, just for these reasons, there was not enough inventiveness, enterprise and adaptability to new conditions to enable this magnificent civilization to overcome the social and economic difficulties with which it was called upon to contend. And the situation was such that it had either to overcome these difficulties or to succumb from failure to do so.

As I have said before, history never repeats itself exactly; and the economic difficulties of our modern civilization are in many ways different from those of the Ancient World. But I am privileged this morning to address, among the congregation here present, a body of men who have a unique experience of the multifarious and infinitely complex economic problems of the present day. I know, therefore, that I am speaking to an audience which understands far better than I do myself both the nature and the magnitude of the economic difficulties of our modern civilization, and I am addressing men and women who are in London this week precisely because they are solicitous to seek for some solution.

During the last few years there have been raised the voices of able men, both in this country and on the continent of Europe, proclaiming to the world that our modern Western civilization is already on the down grade, that we, like the Greeks and Romans at the beginning of the Christian era, have our period of greatest achievement behind and not in front, and that we, like they, are at the beginning of a decline which will ultimately, for our civilization as for that of Rome, culminate in complete disaster. And in this decline, which is confidently pro-

CONFERENCE OF MODERN CHURCHMEN

Oxford 1925

SUBJECT:

The Faith of a Modern Churchman

THE Conference will be held in Oxford from *August 24th—31st*. The meetings will be in the Debating Hall at **the Union,** by kind permission of the President and Standing Committee, who also offer the privileges of temporary membership to men attending the Conference.

Services will be at St. Giles' at 8 a.m. and 6 p.m. daily, and also in the chapel at St. Hugh's at 8 a.m.

The Conference will be open to members of the Churchmen's Union, and also as far as space will allow to those who are in sympathy with its principles and objects.

Accommodation will be provided at **Somerville College** and at **St. Hugh's** from Monday **afternoon,** August 24th, until Monday **morning,** August 31st.

Owing to the large numbers who now attend the Conferences, it is no longer found practicable for members of the committee to allot the rooms. This will therefore be done by the College authorities, **but all correspondence should be sent to the Hon. Secretary to the Conference Committee.** As a general rule members of the 1924 Conference who stayed at St. Hugh's will be given rooms at Somerville and *vice versa*. But owing to the difficulty of allotting rooms beforehand, all members of the Conference should on their arrival in Oxford, make enquiries at Somerville.

The Committee Room and Office will be at Somerville, which is half-way between St. Hugh's and the Union.

Tickets (including board and lodging) will be £3 15s. 0d. for the week, £2 15s. 0d. for the first five days; non-members of the Churchmen's Union an additional 10/-. *If not paid before August 1st an extra charge of 5/- will be made.* A limited number of persons finding their own accommodation may have meals in college at a reasonable charge. **Tickets for the meetings** only will be 15/-; for those engaged in teaching 7/6. Admission to single meetings 2/-.

Only under very exceptional circumstances can rooms be booked for fewer than five days, or money be refunded should they be occupied for a shorter period.

Railway Fares. The railway companies are unable to issue tickets at a reduced rate, as last year only 131 members availed themselves of the privilege, the minimum being 200.

Omnibus Service. The ordinary services on the Banbury and the Woodstock Road will be supplemented by additional 'buses between the two Colleges and the Union, both before and after the meetings.

Meals. Breakfast, 8-45; Lunch, 1-15; Tea, 4—5; Dinner, 7 o'clock.

Tennis. A small charge will be made for the use of the courts and balls.

Application for Tickets may be made to the Hon. Secretary after June 1st. It is requested that a cheque and a stamped addressed envelope should be enclosed.

(Miss) DORA NUSSEY,
Upper Ewe Croft, Ilkley, Hon. Secretary.

After August 19th letters should be sent to Somerville.

The Twelfth Modern Churchmen's Conference

THE FAITH OF A MODERN CHURCHMAN

Morning Sessions at 10-15, Evening Sessions at 8-30, except the Presidential Address at 9 o'clock.

MONDAY, August 24th.

Evening. Presidential Address:

Faith and Reason.

The Dean of St. Paul's

TUESDAY, August 25th.

Morning. **Why we believe in God.**

Prof. Caldecott, D.D.

What we believe about God.

J. S. Bezzant, M.A.

Evening. **What we believe about the ethic of the Kingdom.**

Prof. Sorley, Litt.D., LL.D.

Douglas White, M.D.

WEDNESDAY, August 26th.

Morning. **What we believe about Man.**

(*a*) His Nature.

J. C. Hardwick, M.A., B.Sc.

(*b*) His Needs.

Hubert Handley, M.A.

Evening. (*c*) His Hopes.

W. M. Pryke, B.D.

THURSDAY, August 27th.

Morning. **Why we believe in Jesus Christ.**
Prof. Bethune-Baker, D.D.
Miss Maude Royden

Evening. **Superstition.**
Alfred Fawkes, M.A.

FRIDAY, August 28th.

Morning. **Why we are members of the Church of Christ.**
R. G. Parsons, D.D.

Why we are members of the Church of England.
T. F. Royds, B.D.

Evening. **Why we value the Scriptures.**
Canon M. G. Glazebrook, D.D.

SATURDAY, August 29th.

Morning. **Why we value the Sacraments.**
(*a*) Baptism and Confirmation.
H. D. A. Major, D.D.

(*b*) Eucharist.
The Bishop of Birmingham.

Evening. **Are Modern Churchmen dishonest?**
Prof. Percy Gardner, D.Litt., LL.D., F.B.A
Sir Arthur Hort, Bt., M.A.

SUNDAY, August 30th.

Morning Service at Christ Church Cathedral at 10 a.m.
Preacher: Rev. W. W. Longford, D.D.

Evening Service at St. Mary the Virgin at 6-30 p.m.
Preacher: Rev. L. Elliot Binns, B.D.
(late Hulsean Lecturer at Cambridge).

Hemsley & Sons, Printers, Ilkley.

phesied, economic causes, which are partly the consequence of war and the class war, and partly a fruitful source of more war and more class war, will be the principal and most obvious agents.

I may say at once that, in my opinion, it holds good of our civilization as of that of Rome that, unless we can find some solution of the more pressing economic problems of our time, nothing but decadence and disaster is in store. But I am not proposing to set before you this morning the outlines of any solution. That is not my business. For a person like myself to attempt to offer any advice on economic questions to the assembled representatives of the National Chamber of Trade would be palpably absurd. But it does come within my province, both as a student of history and as a minister of religion, to emphasize the point that in this twentieth, no less than in the first, century of our era the solution of the economic problems of the day is in the last resort dependent on there first being a *moral revival.*

I have used the words 'moral revival' advisedly; but by the phrase 'moral revival' I am far from meaning merely a reassertion of the accepted principles of good conduct and a renewed resolution to live up to them—though, if that were to take place on a large scale, something of quite enormous value would have been gained. What I mean is something wider, *viz.*, a complete change in the attitude both of the individual and of society towards all the complex issues of commerce and finance, capital and labour, work and organization. What is wanted is a new morality of work, a new morality of co-operation, and a heightened sense of responsibility which will regard both production and distribution as being not only means of individual profit, but as vital and necessary activities of public service.

I have said already that the failure of the ancient civilization to solve its economic problems was ultimately a moral failure. You will ask me: Where, then, did Christianity come in? The historian must answer by saying that Christianity arrived upon the scene too late to save the Ancient World. It began in a small way; 'not many rich, not many noble,' says St. Paul, belonged to the first community. It was only by slow degrees that the new religion spread to the better educated and more influential classes. It was nearly a couple of hundred

years before the Church reached a position of such influence that it was taken very seriously by those who held the reins of power, and then several deliberate attempts were made to stamp it out by rigorous persecution on a world-wide scale. It was more than three hundred years after the birth of Christ before the Emperor Constantine tried the opposite policy of attempting to utilise the moral fervour of Christianity for the regeneration of the State. But by that time it was too late. The Church itself had been largely corrupted by a decadent civilization, and the social, economic and military problems of the State no longer admitted of other than 'stop-gap' solutions. Within a hundred years Western Europe, its strength sapped by internal rottenness, had succumbed to the barbarian invader. All that the Church could do then was 'to pick up the pieces,' so to speak, to keep alive, amid the darkness of the ensuing centuries, some beggarly remains of the education and respect for law and order of the old civilization.

But here I come to a new point. I cannot make clear what kind of moral revival is wanted to-day without first saying a word about the kind of morality which the Church in past times has tried to teach. No religious institution can remain unaffected by the thought and by the economic conditions, by the political and social environment, of the civilization in which it exists. Now for the first eight hundred years of its existence the Christian Church was recruited from men and women born and brought up in an age which had lost hope for itself and its future, which was consciously aware that all things were on the down grade, which was intellectually decadent, economically exhausted, and morally despairing. It is not wonderful under such circumstances that the ordinary emphasis of the Christian teacher was on the idea of escape from this world rather than on the duty of endeavouring to improve it. Hence arose the dominance of an ascetic and monastic ideal of religion which lived on all through the Middle Ages. That ideal was the natural result of the external circumstances of a Church which had grown up in a civilization consciously decadent.

But at the Reformation that emphasis was changed. The changes in regard to doctrine and ceremony resultant from the Reformation are matters in regard to the expedience of which there may legitimately be differences of opinion. To my mind

changes in such things are relatively unimportant. A far more vital change was that made in regard to the moral and practical aspects of life—the change of emphasis as to the essence of Christian obligation.

Henceforth, in the countries which had accepted the Reformation, it was taught that the highest duty of man, and his best opportunity of serving God, is to be found, not in the seclusion of the monastery or in the multiplication of external acts of worship, but in the home, in the counting-house, and in the duties of civic life. Henceforth the taking up of the Cross, which is essential to any genuine following of Christ, was interpreted, not as a call to the fastings and scourgings of the cloister, but as a summons to that service of our fellow-men which necessarily entails a sacrifice of self, and to that championship of social and individual liberty, of progress and of reform which (by the opposition which it invokes) always exposes the reformer to hostility and frequently to persecution.

This brings me to the point up to which I have been endeavouring to work. The moral revival which, as it seems to me, must come about, if our civilization is not to be crushed by the sheer magnitude of its economic necessities, is one which must go one stage further than did our ancestors, but in the same direction—in the direction, that is, of consecrating to the service of God and man the everyday activities and the ordinary avocations of life. And in our time this means, first and foremost, the carrying out of the activities on which the economic direction and organization of modern civilization depends *as a moral and religious task.*

To make quite clear what I have in mind I will give two concrete illustrations. First, I see no hope for modern civilization unless economic conflict between employers and employed can be got entirely out of the atmosphere of what is known as 'the class war.' I see some signs of a more hopeful atmosphere in this regard. I see indications of a wider recognition that Capital and Labour, so far from being inherently hostile, are necessary to one another. It is being realised that, alike in production and distribution, the inventor and organizer on the one hand, and the manual labourer on the other, are each helpless without the other. But wherever two sections of men are compelled to work together, harmonious working inevitably leads to

efficiency and success, while grudging co-operation, friction and resentment, as inevitably produce the opposite result. But harmonious co-operation between persons whose interests, though partially, are far from being entirely, identical, is quite impossible unless there be present a considerable element of mutual confidence and mutual good-will. This means that employers and employed must come to regard themselves and one another, not merely as representatives of divergent economic interests, but as human beings, as personalities, having the inalienable right which belongs to every human personality to self-respect, to justice, and to courteous treatment.

It is a commonplace of social observers that much of the friction between employers and employed at the present day is the result of the disappearance, in large concerns and under the conditions of modern industry, of the old personal individual contact between the two classes. Gentlemen, I am not an employer of labour; many of you are. I cannot instruct you how to solve a problem which I have never had myself to face. How can that touch of personal interest, that feeling of human sympathy, the casual word of courtesy or appreciation, which means so much in common intercourse, and which comes so easy where those concerned are few—how can these things be in some way or other re-introduced into the huge factory system or the immense distributing agency of the present day? *I* do not know. There is an ancient Greek proverb, 'Whatever is worth doing is difficult'; and I am speaking to men who by hard thinking, initiative, and experiment are daily in the habit of finding the solution of difficulties, some of them far greater than this. It is not for me to tell you how to solve this difficulty. Obviously there is no one way; it must be solved by different men in different ways. My function is ended in indicating that the problem of developing the human touch and the personal relations in industry is one of those moral problems which lies behind some of our most grievous economic perplexities.

I will venture a second illustration and a suggestion. Before deciding what I should say to you this morning, I carefully read through the *Annual Report* of the National Chamber of Trade. I was specially interested to notice certain allusions to political, social and economic legislation in their bearing on

the productive and creative function of commerce viewed from the point of view of *trade as a public service and as a national interest*. As I read through the report it seemed to me that, although the main purpose and a good deal of the activity of the National Chamber of Trade and its various affiliated societies is avowedly the championship of the economic interests of its members, it has become something more and other than this. I mean that the mere fact that the Chamber is on a national basis and includes practically every branch of productive and distributive trading has compelled it to take a view of production and distribution as of a constructive national work of vital consequence for our whole civilization. There can be no doubt that this is a true and a right view. However much individuals who engage in production or distribution, or who invest their money in undertakings of a commercial character, may be themselves actuated by motives of personal profit, nevertheless—in the long run and with certain not very important exceptions—no sane observer can deny that production and distribution are the foundations of modern civilization. It follows that—whatever the motives which may lead individuals to engage in them—these activities constitute a national service second in importance to none.

This fact, that production and distribution are a necessary public service, is one so obvious as to seem hardly worth reiterating. Unfortunately, however, the public mind of this country has been extremely slow to realise the moral implications of this state of things. I mean this. In the Army, the Navy, in the Medical Profession or the Church, a man's occupation is recognized by himself and by others—in ordinary talk, in literature and in general esteem—as being a participation in a public service. And the mere fact that it is so recognized—this is the point I wish to emphasize—makes all the difference to the way in which the individual sets about and views both his work and the payment he receives for doing it. I see no reason to believe that people who go into the Army or the Navy, or even the Church, are indifferent to the question whether their services are adequately remunerated or not. But in these occupations public opinion takes it for granted that the services rendered are in themselves valuable and that the work is well worth doing quite apart from the remuneration which the individual

receives for doing it. The consequence is that in these professions the individual, though far from being indifferent to the remuneration he receives, does not get into the habit of regarding the remuneration as the first and most important consideration. It is in the work itself that he is primarily interested—the creating, the organizing, the service rendered. Now it is my own belief—and my impressions are derived from personal friendship with men who have achieved distinct success in the world of commerce—that in business, as much as in the Army or the Navy, success depends upon the extent to which a man's heart is in the *work for its own sake*, and that by such men profits are valued much more as an outward and visible sign of efficiency and success than for their money value.

In the business world, then, at the present moment the conception of *trade as a public service* is one that already exists. But if this conception were to become more and more the dominating conception, as it is in professions like the Army or the Navy, no small part of the 'moral revival' I speak of would have taken place.

There already exists in the world of commerce the delight in efficiency for its own sake; there already exists a real love of good work well done, a healthy rivalry in the quality of goods produced, or in the promptitude of goods delivered; there is a high pride in the honourable traditions of a firm. This spirit, which is the salt of modern commerce, is simply another, and as it were the internal, aspect of the conception of commerce as public service. Unfortunately there is still an idea about that in trade the ideal of public service, or of efficiency or quality for its own sake, is of the nature of an amiable weakness in those who are inspired by them. That is an idea which all men of good-will are called upon to fight. One great difficulty in so doing is the fear of insincerity—the one thing that the ordinary Englishman shrinks from is professing, even to himself, to be better than he is. Rather than incur this suspicion many a man in business prefers to talk as if his own aims and objects were always and in every way solely directed towards personal profit. But to pretend to be worse than one is, is no less hypocritical than pretending to be better than one is; indeed, in an age like the present, which is perishing for want of moral leadership, it probably does more harm.

I want to get this point about profit and public service quite clear. Personal profit, I readily admit, is a motive which will always actuate humanity; I go further, and say (what all of you know) that the people who tell you that they are entirely unaffected by this motive either deceive themselves or are attempting to deceive you. But what I do maintain is that there are very few men who are wholly indifferent to the claims of public service; and there are very few who do not prefer honesty, efficiency and good work to their opposites. Now what I mean by a 'moral revival' is not something which is going to alter the fundamental characteristics of humanity; but something which is going to fortify the higher and nobler impulses in the heart of man, so as to enable these to get the predominance over the selfish and less noble impulses. And I am convinced that, if a body of persons like that I am addressing this morning, or even a considerable proportion of them, were definitely and publicly to identify themselves with the conception of commerce as public service, they would create a new public opinion, and this would generate a new hope and a new energy which would, in the course of a generation, lead on to the discovery of practical solutions of the social and economic problems which distress us —and so permanently avert the disaster with which our civilization is threatened.

The Reformation made the layman his own master in religion; but being one's own master means shouldering responsibility. The moral regeneration of society to-day rests, not with the minister of religion, but with the layman; and it depends, not on the professional advocates of social and political reform, but on the men who are in actual control of the working of the machine of commerce. It is upon you, gentlemen, that the responsibility lies of formulating for yourselves and holding up before the world the ideals which you, and those who will follow your leadership, intend to strive for. With you rests the opportunity of translating into practice one part at least of the prayer: Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth.

PRAYER.

Almighty God, who hast called us Thy servants to be fellow-workers with Thy Son Jesus Christ in the establishment of Thy Kingdom among men, open our eyes, we beseech Thee, that we may see, and inspire our hearts that we may love the tasks which Thou hast appointed to each one of us, and strengthen our wills to perform the same.

THE COMPLEXITY OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

By Alice Gardner, M.A. Bristol, sometime Fellow of Newnham College, author of *The Lascarids of Nicaea, Theodore of Studium,* &c.

READERS of the *Modern Churchman* have already seen a review of Dr. Brilioth's book, *The Anglican Revival,* which renders a general summary or criticism of it superfluous. If that review has sent them to the book itself, they will have received further illumination as to its character and purport in the excellent Introduction by the Bishop of Gloucester. But so important and many-sided a work affords scope for much meditation and discussion.

At the outset it may be remarked that it is extremely wholesome for English readers to obtain some insight into the impression which their institutions and changes make on observers belonging to another nation. In this particular case there has been, perhaps, a tendency to minimize the importance of the Movement because it was essentially *insular.* True, our political and perhaps our social institutions have attracted the notice of our continental neighbours in many ways; but our ecclesiastical history has all along been *sui generis,* and this episode in it particularly so. The German historians seem, generally speaking, not to have felt much interest in the Oxford Movement. But this Swedish work is really remarkable for insight, sympathy, and thoroughness, and may be of assistance in broadening our own views as to the significance of our peculiar experiences.

When we try to make a comprehensive survey of the subject, we seem to encounter a host of paradoxical or mutually exclusive characters attributed to it. We have just seen one: (1) was it insular or far-reaching in character and results? Another question, (2) was it of the nature of progress, or an attempt at reaction to a distant past? (3) Was it mainly institutional—aiming at reforms in external order? Or did it call forth vital forces and appeal to individual convictions and aspirations? (4) Had it a bracing and stimulating effect on

art and literature, or were its products only of a sickly or ephemeral character? (5) Have its achievements in social life been mainly for the better or the worse? (6) Is it compatible with a love of truth—in science and history, in common life, above and beyond usefulness and quiet,—or does it, when pressed, fall back on the superiority of the heart to the head? Probably individuals will answer these questions one way or another according to the character of the persons or the literature from which their judgment has been formed. But a thorough historical study like that of Dr. Brilioth ought to help towards a better understanding both of the movement as a whole and of the characters of its chief representatives.

(2). With regard to the progressive or reactionary character of the movement it may be said that, in a sense, it was both. The same may be said of many other tendencies to revive principles and practices which we admire in their survivals, but which we cannot retain nor even imitate with success: witness premature revivals in art, especially architecture, and rehabilitation of the social and political ideas which we find in ancient and mediaeval history. We understand now, better than even half a century ago, that our power of recovering the past is strictly limited. True, the study of the past becomes more and more profitable as we learn more of the processes of human and natural development;—and as our range of knowledge concerning what is best worth knowing in the past is more on the increase. But in the early days of the Oxford Movement, the idea of development was very much restricted in application—if it existed at all, and a great deal of the charm of past days lay in their independence of modern conditions. One of Dr. Brilioth's most attractive chapters (V) is on the Romantic Movement, which deals with the interest aroused in the Mediaeval Church by the writings of Sir Walter Scott, Coleridge, and Wordsworth a link between Romanticism and the Oxford Movement being found in Keble, who introduced Scott as Professor of Poetry at Oxford, with a 'warm tribute of homage.' The question whether either the Oxford Movement or the Romantic Movement has enabled us to understand the Middle Ages better is a doubtful question. Both may have given us a *couleur de rose* vision. Yet apart from either, our notions might have been no nearer to reality.

(3). A still more important question is whether the character of the Movement was institutional or vital. Perhaps the author would put the question thus: 'Was the static or the dynamic element preponderant therein?' The use of the words *static* and *dynamic* is, of course, not in a purely mechanical sense; nor is it equivalent to that of *social statics* and *social dynamics* in the works of Comte and Mill. To quote Brilioth (chap. ix, p. 127):

> 'The static (development) is represented by the effort to go back to the past—*stare super antiquas vias,* to restore and maintain a form of church and religion which it was believed could be found in its present form in a certain phase of the development of the English reformed church and earlier in the primitive church . . . The progressive element has a far greater religious elasticity.'

The chapter in which this passage occurs should be studied in its entirety by all who wish to grasp Dr. Brilioth's principle of criticism.[1]

It may seem almost incredible to those who realize the force and activity of Newman's mind that he should have absorbed—somewhat, apparently, *à contre coeur*—the doctrine of Apostolic Succession in a walk with a friend round Christ Church Meadow. He and his companions were able to procure evidence which satisfied them as to facts, though a feeling of the need for a guarantee both of Anglican and of Roman orders may have stimulated the desire to believe. But on other occasions, Newman is found on the 'progressive' or 'dynamic' side of the question as to ecclesiastical order, and looks to the *character* which is fostered by a church as the test of its validity.[2] Here the author finds an element of Pragmatism, though Newman would probably have repudiated anything of the kind. There may seem to be some inconsistency in upholding the superiority of inward gifts to constitutional order, and at the same time resisting to the utmost the proposition of a Jerusalem Bishopric, designed to meet the needs of

[1] I would compare, as representing the essential point in Dr. Brilioth's distinction between *static* and *dynamic*, the difference made by Dean Inge in *Faith and its Psychology*, p. 96. 'By a static view of revelation, as opposed to a dynamic, I mean the theory that a special revelation was at some time past granted to mankind, which now persists only in its effects. The date when the authoritative and infallible revelation began and when it ceased may be fixed anywhere, being purely arbitrary.'

[2] See p. 159.

English episcopalians and German Protestants, the Bishop having received Anglican consecration. The principle at stake (of equality in church status between English episcopalians and German Lutherans) was so decidedly condemned by the Oxford Tractarians that the promoters were obliged to give it up. We may look upon it either as a great opportunity missed, or as a prudent withdrawal of an impracticable scheme; in either case as an assertion of the static against any dynamic principle.

Certainly those who can remember—in mid-Victorian days—the kind of arguments raised in evangelical and perhaps in commonsense circles against the new usages—would say that they were based on indifference to outward and visible things as compared with inward and spiritual. Processions, elaborate music, still more ecclesiastical vestments seemed in evangelical society to be opposed to the 'simplicity of the Gospel.' This language has, however, lost its currency, though there is still in many quarters a fear lest particular objects of religion may come to be more regarded than religion itself. Perhaps the feeling that religious services and religious music *ought* to be beautiful preceded, in High Church circles, a general appreciation of beauty in relation to religious music, architecture, and art generally, which was to come in due course from sounder education on the historical and aesthetic bearings of the subject. For the aberrations of High Church ideas as to symbolism and antiquarianism, where zeal was more active than knowledge, modern readers may be referred to the contemporary literature, including the pictures in *Punch*. But the genuine High Church movement was strong enough to survive both jests and exaggerations. It is interesting to observe how much more of seemliness and regard for order and fitness there is now in the lowest of Low Church services, and in even those of Nonconformists, than there was half a century ago.

(4). These considerations may help us to estimate the literary and educational value of the Movement. Independently (if such independence is possible) of the philosophic or historical opinions of the leaders in all religious movements, their peculiar powers of thought and utterance are bound to have permanent results. If Luther had had less mastery of the German language and less appreciation of poetry and music, possibly his doctrines would not have spread among the

people and his influence would have been less potent and far-reaching. Later, it was the educational power of the Jesuits that brought about the Catholic Reaction. The Anglican Revival was originally a University movement. The value of theological and biblical learning was inculcated by its most noted representatives. At the same time, it was averse to the destructive influences of the period, in England and the Continent, and was so far antipathetic to revolutionary propaganda. What there was of revolution about the Movement in its incipient stages is described by Dr. Brilioth in his account of Oriel soon after Newman became a Fellow, in which the *Noetics*, an 'intellectual group of mildly liberal tendency,' according to Mark Pattison, stirred up one another to appeal to first principles and disallow authority in intellectual matters, though ignorant both of German philosophy and of French social speculation. Newman could not or did not read German—a fact, perhaps, of parallel importance with the circumstance that Augustine did not naturally and easily read Greek.

In looking at the Movement and the attitude of its leaders to the doings and tendencies of their times, we are again and again struck by the truth of the saying that 'the Best is the enemy of the Good' (though the terms *Best* and *Good* may be variously attributed). Thus the hopeless antagonism of Newman to Arnold of Rugby is all the more deplorable in that both liked to cite, in the case of conflicts of opinion, the text: 'If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine.' The antagonism between Newman and Kingsley seems to be based on an antithesis of temperament rather than on fundamental disagreement. But a remark of Gladstone's on the relation of a pietistic movement earlier than that of Newman may here be quoted:

> 'The Evangelical movement filled some so full with the wine of spiritual life that larger and better vessels were required to hold it' (p. 43).

Whether Gladstone would have said the same of the relation of the Oxford Movement to any of our own time, may be doubted—but at least suggested. As to the general intellectual result: the Movement certainly led to increased activity in many minds that came within its range of influence. If to anyone the acceptance of authority lessened the labour of think-

ing out for oneself questions of casuistry or of discipline which might else have been felt as a burden on the individual mind and conscience, the relief experienced would seem to be wholesome or the reverse according to the moral, intellectual and spiritual capacity of the particular person to whom the relief had been granted. It is not always realized how much more support is required by some persons than by others, though the individual conscience must always give the final decision as to whether in general the authority acknowledged is really worthy of trust.

The Best as enemy of the Good is seen yet more painfully in the hopeless resistance of the Oxford leaders to those political reforms which justice and sound policy dictated, but which were fatal to any identification of State and Church. The opening of the Universities to Nonconformist students, the reduction in number of Irish Sees, and subsequently the disestablishment of the Irish Church, the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, and similar measures were simply acts of justice, tardy in arrival, and in some cases advocated and carried out by sincere members of the Church of England, even by so devoted an admirer of Newman as Mr. Gladstone. But they struck at the root of the idea of Church and State as united in membership and in principles, only divided with the partial division of their separate functions. Happily in this case, there was scope for mutual respect on both sides of the questions at stake.

(5). The social effects of the Movement are not easy to discover, and the more important of these seem to belong to a period following the critical days. We naturally associate with Manning the appeal to the poor and ignorant, whom with notable exceptions, the comfortably-living evangelicals had not taken so seriously as did the second or third generation of tractarians. But it was Pusey who first instituted Anglican Sisters of Mercy, and thereby initiated a movement the beneficent results of which are now universally acknowledged. It is a good thing for the Church of England, and especially for its influence on the lower strata of society, that the social and religious cleavages—to say nothing of the political—have not generally been on the same lines: that with us at the present day schemes for social and religious betterment are often run

in common by members of different denominations, or by persons outside any organized religious system. No societies within or without the English Church have a monopoly of Christian philanthropy. The co-existence and overlapping of charitable agencies has had some undesirable results: but certainly the co-operation of leading men and women of many types and of various experience has tended towards more reasonable methods of social and educational advancement. Among High Churchmen at the present day we find laudable efforts for raising up competent religious teachers from the working classes. Doubtless there is something to be said for the 'static' [?] clergy of previous days, whose utility was supposed to consist in keeping up the very desirable arrangement of 'one gentleman in every parish.' But, owing to circumstances which we cannot entirely deplore, excellent parochial work may now be done by men who have risen from the ranks, and may or may not have been brought up on the old learning. It is a great thing gained from the revival of patristic studies if, with all the regard they may have for new learning and new social ideals, our leaders still look back with reverence on the great thoughts and spiritual achievements of earlier and, in some respects, more luminous times, or at least times of more luminous teachers.

(6). But none of these questions is so important for our general appreciation of the Oxford Movement as that of its relation to the desire for truth—at all costs—irrespective of any evident or practical advantage of true over false belief or of knowledge over ignorance.

It was certainly a happy thing for the English Church and for English society generally, that the leaders of the Movement were men of culture and in some cases of wide learning. In fact, it was impossible that things should be otherwise, seeing that the revival began and was continued in a university. But deep learning in some departments of thought and study need not always be associated with progressiveness in newly-opened regions. It is sufficient if those working in the old fields are able to extend some sympathy and encouragement to labourers in the new. Only to a limited extent was this the case with the leaders of the Oxford Movement; the patristic and ecclesiological works, as well as the Hebrew and patristic

studies of Pusey, Newman and their colleagues are still valued; but in theological and biblical studies, the present generation naturally looks to quarters where old tradition has more or less ceded to criticism of a kind that they would sedulously have avoided. And apart from distinctly religious studies, education and learning have been directed along progressive lines unknown even to giants of the past. Furthermore, modern ideas of inspiration, infallibility, development, &c., belong to regions of thought to which the earlier leaders were strange, though some of their successors are definitely progressive.

But the question as to possible limitations is an important one, since many who honour and admire the Oxford reformers would repudiate their leadership if it were proved to be inconsistent with the desire for truth at all hazards.

In the Bishop of Gloucester's Preface to Dr. Brilioth's book there is a reference to a statement by Canon Storr that the religious mind is indifferent to truth. Dr. Brilioth hardly ventures on such a sweeping assertion, but he does say (chap. xii, p. 210) that—

> 'it is part of the peculiar tragedy of Church history that the overwhelming feeling of the one thing necessary, the salvation of the soul, finds it difficult to recognize the demand for truth as an equally justified aspect of revelation.'

In the school of thought to which Newman originally belonged, *truth* or *the truth* was placed as high as possible in the scale, because acceptance of 'the truth' was itself part or the whole of the condition of salvation: there was no scope for a Socratic idea of fearless search after truth as the highest function of humanity; or rather the search must be limited in direction and intensity by the fixed mandates of ecclesiastical authority. This applies, of course, just as much to evangelical principles of biblical infallibility as to the pronouncements of an infallible church. Doubtless there is zeal for good learning to be found along with obedience even to monastic rule (were not the latest experiments in Variation made in a monastery garden?)—but there cannot be an intellectually alert society in which each member considers that the salvation of his own soul according to accepted principles is far more important (at least for him) than the growth of human knowledge or even of human virtue. A brighter side of the question is seen in the desire to save

other people's souls. But neither impulse is a socially constructive, still less a scientifically progressive, force.

Of course, the leaders of the Revival had, generally speaking, great ideas, which went far beyond any egotistic or sectional objects. The Church was to 'make saints.' The world of Nature was to be regarded as symbolic of the Divine Life in which all things live and move. Dr. Brilioth's twelfth chapter, on the *Fundamental Forms of Tractarian Piety*, must prove more attractive and instructive to many readers than any other part of the book. But perhaps to modern thinkers it may seem that the leaders of the Revival just fell short of the conception of the Divine in Nature and in the life of the world as the great Reality of which the regions of sense and experience are but a partial adumbration. Keble (in Tract 89) on the Mysticism attributed to the 'early Fathers of the Church,' as in some portion of the *Christian Year*, comes near to the sacramental or symbolic view of life and religion, but the anti-mystic tendencies of the age, and even of religious thought—at that time—were against the assertion of principles which could not be stated as dogmas.

Certainly a religion which ignores the desire of truth for its own sake, whether it may assume the forms and language of the old reasonable self-love, or of American pragmatism (necessary as such forms may be at times and places) will fail to become universal, or even widely prevalent. But these considerations would lead us beyond our present limits.

Our deep thanks are due to Dr. Brilioth for enabling us to 'see ourselves as others see us.' Such service is especially valuable where the 'others' are near to us in spiritual sympathy and experience, while far removed from our local disappointments and failures. We suffer at times from obscurity of vision due to local and national limitations, and are dependent on our friends of other nations and other churches for an adequate realization of our own powers. It is here, then, that we can best learn our special place and function in the life of Christendom at large.

FORTY YEARS OF RELIGION AND SCIENCE (1884–1924)

By the Rev. T. F. Royds, B.D., Rector of Haughton, Stafford, author of *The Beasts, Birds, and Bees of Virgil.*

IN the year 1884 Archbishop Temple published his Bampton Lectures on 'Religion and Science,' and in 1924 was held the Oxford Conference on 'The Scientific Approach to Religion,' presided over by Dean Inge.

Temple, writing at a time when Darwinism was by no means fully baptized into Christ, speaks of 'the present estrangement between Religion and Science.' Since then, it has become more usual to speak of their reconciliation, or to describe them as moving on parallel lines, which never meet, and therefore cannot clash. But Dr. Inge, in his presidential address at Oxford, called the conflict between Science and Religion 'an open sore which poisons the spiritual life of the civilized world.' 'It is difficult,' he said, 'for a man to accept orthodox Christianity as the Churches present it, without treachery to his scientific conscience. The injury thus inflicted upon religion can hardly be measured. Intellectual honesty is, to a large extent, strained out of the Church, and public opinion within it does not reflect either the best knowledge or the most candid temper of the community.'[1]

One might think from the Dean's words that things were no better now than forty years ago. But this is not so, and he recognizes the fact. He recalls the days of Huxley and Wilberforce, and remarks how impossible such a Conference would have been a hundred or even fifty years ago: 'We seem to have moved centuries since those days.' But the open sore remains. Let us see how Temple dealt with the crisis of his day. Eminent theologians had denounced Darwinism as subversive of the faith. 'Humble Christians,' armed with the arrogance of ignorance, had rushed into the fray, and claimed the right of saints to judge scientists. The scientists, of course,

[1] *Modern Churchman*, Sep. 1924.

retaliated, and 'wise' men cast anchors out of the stern and wished for the day.

Many spectators of the battle thought that their choice lay between the new science and the old orthodoxy, and they chose the new science. In Temple's words:

> Students of Science, informed by instant voices all around that they must choose between their Science and the Bible, knowing as they did that their Science was true, and supposing that the lovers and defenders of the Bible best knew what its teaching was, had no choice as honest men but to hold the truth as far as they possessed it and to give up the Bible in order to maintain their Science.'[2]

Temple saw that the origin of the human species was a purely scientific question, and therefore must be left to scientific men. And according to him—

> 'the doctrine of Evolution leaves the argument for an intelligent Creator and Governor of the world stronger than it was before.'[3]

It is remarkable that these Lectures do not seem to have shocked the religious world at the time, yet it was at least another ten years before their main conclusions were assimilated by the Church. *Lux Mundi*, which was first published in 1889, must have felt their influence, and was fiercely denounced by Liddon as 'Gore's miserable book.' Liddon, by the way, had expressly repudiated Darwinism in his Bampton Lectures on the 'Divinity of Christ,' published in 1866, and his opinions seem to have undergone no change. Equally, Bishop Gore has insisted on holding the ground won in *Lux Mundi*. But for *Lux Mundi* the battle-ground was no longer that of Science alone. Historical criticism was becoming a powerful ally of the new science, and of that I must not turn aside to write here. From Temple's Bamptons of 1884 I take a leap of twenty years to Driver's *Genesis* and Waggett's *Religion and Science*, the latter one of the new 'Handbooks for the Clergy,' and both published in 1904. The first was favourably reviewed by *The Guardian*, and immediately became a standard authority for theological students. The second raised more problems than it solved; but, as a well-known divine observed, Father Waggett's chief aim was not to allay doubts and fears, but to prevent the clergy from talking nonsense. And now we have two more books on the same subject, the Rev. J. C. Hardwick's

[2] *Bampton Lectures*, p. 244.
[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 122.

Religion and Science, published in 1920 by the S.P.C.K.—a valuable survey of thought from Galileo to Bergson—and Professor J. A. Thomson's *Science and Religion*, published in 1925, and therefore outside the scope of this article.

Professor Thomson's excellent *Introduction to Science* in the Home University Library (1911) contains a chapter on 'Religion and Science,' from which I take the following memorable passage:

> 'Science establishes conclusions which the religious mood may utilize, just as philosophy utilizes them, and transfigure, just as poetry transfigures them; but it is the common confession of the scientific mood throughout all the ages that we cannot "by searching find out God." But is it not much that Science discloses more and more fully the intelligibility, the orderliness, and the progressiveness of Nature? These are big intellectual assets. Is it not much that Science discloses more and more fully the wonder of the world—the immensities and the intricacies, the changing order and the orderly changes, besides all the beauty in depths and heights which the unscientific eye cannot see? These are big emotional assets. Is there not practical value, too, both of encouragement and warning, in the scientific view that it is an ascent, not a descent, that is behind us—and in front of us, too, we hope? Everything seems to indicate that it is an increasingly controllable future that lies before us here, and it surely adds zest to our life to feel that we can share in the "increasing purpose" of evolution, in the working out of what seems like a great and beautiful thought.'

II.

Those who believe in the Christian revelation are not likely to forget that there are realms of thought into which Science cannot soar. 'No man can say that Jesus is LORD but in the Holy Spirit.' Science cannot give sight to the spiritually blind. Spiritual things are spiritually discerned, and without holiness no man shall see the Lord. 'The last attainment of reason,' said Pascal, 'is to recognize that there is an infinity of things beyond it.' Nor has Science any direct business with the poetry and music of life, the laughter and tears of things, the whole tragedy and comedy of human existence. Darwin himself was a melancholy example of the narrowing influence of purely physical science. The hypertrophy of one faculty is apt to produce the atrophy of another. But no doubt he would have been the first to maintain that in his case the sacrifice of the power to appreciate music and poetry was worth while. And are not we ministers of religion apt to forget that the spiritual faculties are usually developed at some cost to

the rational? The law of atrophy and hypertrophy follows hard upon the heels of sainthood, and few minds are large enough to maintain a perfect balance between the mystical, the intellectual, and the institutional elements in religion. If some people are spiritually colour-blind, and impervious to the evidence of religious experience, others are equally impervious to the evidence of scientific observation. How else can we fully account for the absurdities of American Fundamentalism?

Facts are proverbially stubborn things; what is true for Science is true for Religion, and *vice versa*, for Truth cannot contradict itself. But mere knowledge of facts is not everything. Far more important are the mental habits engendered by scientific study. Charles Kingsley dreamed of—

> 'a day when it will be considered necessary that every candidate for ordination should be required to have passed creditably in at least one branch of physical science, if it be only to teach him the method of sound scientific thought.'[4]

The Churches, especially the Roman Church, have insisted on the sinfulness of doubt and the duty of submission to authority, and too often have encouraged the superstition that the more difficult a thing is to believe, the more merit there is in believing it. *Credo quia absurdum.* The trade in magic and miracle continues to thrive. Science, on the other hand, teaches the duty of doubt, the importance of sifting and weighing evidence, and of suspending judgment for indefinite periods. To her the unforgiveable sin is that of confusing certainties with probabilities, and probabilities with possibilities. Her cardinal virtue is intellectual honesty. But intellectual honesty is a plant that blooms with difficulty in religious climates.

To von Hügel perfect truthfulness was 'the most delicately difficult of all the virtues for the average institutional religionist.' 'Veracity,' said Dr. Martineau, 'is the one grace that Churches never attain.' It is not surprising that the scientific mind, cold and judicial, often clashes with the religious mind, fervent and passionate. The one is occupied with 'endless docility to facts'; the other, putting edification before truth, strives to break in recalcitrant facts and harness them to the

[4] *Life*, Vol. II, p. 258.

chariot of religious orthodoxy. And so a modern novelist describes a parson as 'a chap who has parted with his intellectual chastity, and he'll make you do the same.' The open sore remains: what can we do to heal it?

In the first place, we can go on clearing away the rubbish of that pseudo-science which treats the Gospel as a 'plan of salvation'; parcelling out justification, sanctification, predestination, and election; labelling sins as venial or mortal; mapping out, with the aid of Jewish speculation and the sixth book of the *Aeneid*, heaven and hell, purgatory, and the so-called intermediate state; in short, providing 'superficial standardized solutions for the problems of existence.'

Secondly, we must recognize that the science of the Bible is the science of its age, and apply this commonplace to the New Testament as well as to the Old. For instance, S. Paul believed that physical death was a punishment for the sin of man (*Rom.* v, 12). To him the story of the Fall was history. Why should any of us be afraid to admit that on these points we know better than S. Paul? And when our Lord said that in the beginning God made man and woman, male and female, can we suppose that the discoveries of Darwin were really present to His mind, and that He was accommodating His language to the knowledge of the day? Is it not more reasonable to believe that He had to acquire the natural science of His day like any other Jewish child? The remarkable thing is that so few of His sayings even *seem* to clash with modern science, especially when we remember that in regard to miracle and natural law the gulf between the mind of the first century and that of the twentieth is immense. This is the really serious problem to-day. We have swallowed Evolution and settled down to digest it, as our forefathers did with the Copernican astronomy. The one is as secure as the other, at least in this country. But the miracles of the New Testament may yet provide the Church with a long and bitter struggle. The battle-ground has shifted from *Genesis* to the Creeds. Here, the last word does not belong to Science, but to historical criticism and anthropology. But it is fair to remember that Science has created an immensely strong presupposition against miracle. To the scientific mind the uniformity of Nature is a postulate without which there can be no faith in Science itself.

It is, in fact, the scientific aspect of the faithfulness of God, and the rationality and intelligibility of His universe. It is the scientific bedrock of Monotheism. To present experience there is no such thing as miracle, and the scientific mind finds it not an aid to faith, but a stumbling-block.

III.

If our view of the Bible is thus profoundly affected by modern science, our view of the Book of Common Prayer can be no less so. Perhaps the most obvious instance is prayer for changes of weather, which the revisers have not seen fit to exclude. If the weather ever becomes amenable to human discipline, we may legitimately pray for what we are striving to obtain; but no meteorologist has the faintest doubt that the weather is as much under law as the apparent erratic behaviour of comets, which was formerly thought to be supernaturally determined. Then there is the doctrine of the Sacraments. There is no scientific ground for believing that the brain of an unconscious infant is capable of receiving a spiritual gift, still less for believing that sacramental grace depends on the right words being said and the right acts performed by the right person. The old-fashioned theologian reasons downwards from his interpretation of Scripture; the psychologist begins at the other end and asks what difference is observable between the mental condition of baptized and unbaptized children, and between the religious experience of a devout Catholic and a devout Quaker. We are often reminded that Archbishop Temple thought psychology rather than metaphysics should be the basis of the theology of the future. His foresight is being justified. Clouds and darkness are round about it still, but psychology is a genuine branch of Science, and promises to be of increasing value to Religion.

It is scarcely necessary to insist on the importance of scientific knowledge when we are dealing with the marriage service, birth control, and all that concerns the relations of the sexes, and of the white and coloured races to one another. Much remains undiscovered, perhaps undiscoverable, but we must give up building faith upon the gaps in our knowledge. If the history of the past is any guide, Science will go on steadily

explaining the supernatural till the God of the old theology is driven into a corner. At present there is a tendency among religious people to take refuge in the origin of life. Science has never yet discovered how to produce life from non-living matter. But any day the discovery may be made. Professor Thomson in his new book suggests that 'there has been a continuity of process in the emergence of a natural synthesis from non-living materials—from some colloidal carbonaceous slime activated by ferments.' A mere layman in such matters is no judge of whether this guess is likely to be right; but something of the kind is much more in accordance with our knowledge of the ways of God than the theory that life was introduced into this planet from outside.

The history of the conflict between Science and Religion is largely the story of the natural sphere increasing at the expense of the supernatural. But does this mean that Science has no need of the hypothesis of God? For working purposes, yes, of course. Science has no business with theology. But in effect it means the replacing of a little God by a big one—the dethroning of the God of Paley's *Evidences* and the enthroning of the God who makes his sun to shine on the evil and on the good, and sends his rain on the just and on the unjust. 'In insisting on the continuity of Nature,' says Dr. G. J. Blewitt, 'men of science have been better theologians than the theologians themselves.' The popular distinction between the natural and the supernatural is an artificial one, and tends to that dualism which allowed an eminent judge to define an act of God as 'an event to which no rational cause can be assigned.' Science, as interpreted by Religion, reveals a God who is through all and in all as well as above all—'immanent,' but not therefore less 'transcendent.' For when the ordinary man, using spatial metaphors, speaks of God as in heaven, or above and outside of his world, what does he mean but that the Artificer is greater than his works, the Invisible greater than the visible, which is the expression of Mind, Purpose, and Love?

The materialism of Victorian science is long out of date. That of the present century, with its *élan vital* under several names, has reached a more spiritual interpretation of Nature. Life and mind, not matter and motion, are the great realities;

and Nature no less than the Bible is God's book. The thirteenth chapter of *Wisdom* has come into its own:

> 'For verily all men by nature were but vain who had no perception of God, And from the good things that are seen they gained not power to know him that is, Neither by giving heed to the works did they recognize the artificer; But either fire, or wind, or swift air, Or circling stars, or raging water, or luminaries of heaven, They thought to be gods that rule the world. And if it was through delight in their beauty that they took them to be gods, Let them know how much better than these is their Sovereign Lord; For the first author of beauty created them.'

In God we worship not Goodness only, but Truth and Beauty as well. Of the three a scientific man, as such, must regard Truth as by far the most important. Indeed, it is not too much to say that to some minds the love of Truth is itself a religion; and surely such minds are not far from the kingdom of God. Is it too much to hope that Kingsley's dream will some day be realized, and Science made a regular part of preparation for Ordination? Nothing would so powerfully counteract the narrowing effects of a purely linguistic and theological education. In his last public utterance Dr. Sanday suggested that if Newman had had any tincture of science, the whole course of English religion in the last century would have been different. Science teaches the value of the open mind and of endless patience in the search for truth; which may be, as Lessing thought, a higher thing than the possession of it. And Science has a gospel—the promise of progress in the truth to those who worship the Spirit of Truth—the gospel, too, of the progress of the human race, not fallen from a higher state, but risen from a lower one, and rising slowly and painfully to something more divine.

MEDICINE, RELIGION AND SUPERSTITION*

'Wisdom is justified of all her children.'—*S. Luke* vii. 35.

I CANNOT to-day address members of the British Medical Association, now assembled for their ninety-third Annual Meeting, without expressing pleasure at the opportunity afforded me. I naturally share the regard in which the medical profession is held by all sensible men. My own studies and interests and needs have from time to time brought me into close contact with leaders of medical science in this country. I have had opportunities of measuring the value of their work and of realising the generosity of temper and fineness of character which it can develop. I know of no profession which more naturally leads to breadth of humane sympathy. Your work will not allow you to form any false estimate of human nature, or to ignore the fundamental instincts and appetites of man. But intimate knowledge makes a good physician not cynical but compassionate. Many of you have thus been led to revere the human body, and the spirit of which it is the shrine, as the noblest work of God on earth. The physician who, through the practice of his art, acquires this religious reverence, learns to worship God through service to his fellow-men.

You are, to no small extent, guardians of public morality. Your professional work constantly reminds you of the close connection between clean living and good health. You probably receive more confessions of grave importance than the clergy of the various branches of the Christian Church in this country. You are bound by principles of professional honour not to disclose what is thus revealed to you; and although such an obligation may not be legally recognized, you know that, in fact, no High Court judge would allow you to be forced to violate the confidences which you receive. Because you are thus consulted and trusted you have immense opportunities of influencing the personal lives of your patients. A wise and sympathetic physician of high ideals can hardly fail to be a

*A sermon preached in Bath Abbey, on Tuesday, July 21st, 1925, before the British Medical Association, by the Right Rev. E. W. Barnes, F.R.S., Sc.D., Lord Bishop of Birmingham.

moral inspiration to the section of the community which he serves. His influence will make for social righteousness. He will feel impelled to seek to preserve the purity of family life. If his work lie among the poor he will naturally be sensitive to their especial hardships, and in particular to the evils of overcrowding. Wherever his work may lie, he will be able to advise those connected with social welfare, because he will have a knowledge more direct and more extensive than others can gain.

There are some among us who assume that medical science should, by religious teachers, be mainly considered in relation to public morality. But I would to-day emphasise the religious importance of the regard which physicians and surgeons must necessarily pay to accurate knowledge. Superstition is the bane of medicine no less than of religion. Every thoughtful physician, like every thoughtful clergyman, recognises the power of irrational beliefs. Neither is ignorant of the uses, and especially the base uses, which may be made of such a power. Neither, if he is wise, will allow the immediate utility of irrational emotion to blind him to its dangers. We are living in a strange world where lax morality is matched by lax thought. If some present tendencies are permanent, Western civilization will not escape the intellectual degeneration which finally ruined Greco-Roman civilization some fifteen centuries ago. Take medical science. Until quite modern times the highest level reached by that science was attained by the Hippocratic school in the great age of Greece. During the last century accurate clinical observation and patient research have caused medical science first to reach and then far to surpass that level. The progress which has been made in medical knowledge and surgical skill since, say, the time of Charles II is amazing. Yet are you sure that you can preserve what has been won? Is its value safely rooted in popular esteem? The great triumphs of Greek medicine were gradually, but none the less definitely, ignored. Medicine ceased to be scientific as it became slowly barbarised by folk-beliefs which, especially after the Christian era began (*post hoc* not *propter hoc*), acquired new vitality. From science the populace of the ancient world turned to quackery. Old wives' lore, magical charms, visits to healing shrines, all the paraphernalia of primitive health

cults, renewed their ascendency. And the same recrudescence of magic and superstition which infected medicine found expression in religious extravagance. Are there no signs to-day that people turn from scientific medicine to quackery? You have, I am glad to say, an organized authority which your profession never attained in the ancient world. But can you, with all that authority and the abundant knowledge which it guards, prevent recourse to faith-healers and osteopaths and charlatan psycho-analysts? You might retort and ask whether Bishops can prevent the recrudescence of thinly-disguised magic in Christian worship. The sad truth is that we are alike subject to the same pressure of irrational belief. As that great physician, Clifford Allbutt, said to me, in one of the last conversations which I had with him, 'When superstition attacks religion, it also attacks medicine.' Religion is the first to feel the effects of an uprush of intellectual barbarism. This is natural, for there is in spiritual understanding an emotional element associated with the value-judgments on which all true religion is based. The history, alike of philosophy and theology, shows how difficult it is for humanity to apply reason to the spiritual valuation of human life. Any growing mistrust of reason will therefore show itself rapidly in religious extravagance. But the same impatience of rational thought will gradually spread to other regions, because there are no absolutely watertight compartments in the human mind. The temper of superstition involves dislike of scientific method. After manifesting itself in religion, it will turn upon scientific medicine, because that is the branch of science most closely connected with ordinary life. The obscurity which surrounds the influence of the mind upon the body gives many opportunities to irrational belief. If the doctor fails, thinly-veiled magic may succeed : and, when once the idea gains sway that the Universe is non-rational for human thought, scientific progress is doomed.

In my own Church at the present time there is a deplorable reaction from the scientific theology which was its glory during the last half of the nineteenth century and is still represented by its best theologians. For example, the claim that a priest can endow inanimate matter with spiritual qualities is made with increasing vehemence. Such a claim science can only dismiss

as a superstition. After the Renaissance, when the scientific spirit was re-born in Western Europe, all practices based on this claim were, in the Church of England, brought to an end. They and the belief on which they are based are not Christian. They are far older than Christianity, a remnant of the magic of the infancy of civilization. If the present tendency to go behind the Renaissance to Mediaeval folk-beliefs prevails in the National Church, the prospect before rational medicine and, indeed, all forms of intellectual progress is gloomy. The whole world to-day is laughing at the State of Tennessee, where religious fanaticism is arrayed against a well-attested scientific theory. But opposition to evolution is no more absurd than the belief that a priest can give spiritual qualities to bread or water or oil.

You must often ask yourselves: Why does superstition make a stronger appeal to-day than half a century ago? Why do apparently well-educated men and women among your patients leave you for self-assertive quacks? There are some obvious reasons. The scientific temper is a recent acquisition of humanity. In comparison of the immense antiquity of the human race, it was born but yesterday. Like all recent acquisitions, its place in our mental make-up is insecure. Then, too, it is exacting in its demands and men are mentally lazy. Moreover, during the last century science has made such extraordinarily rapid progress that the mass of men are bewildered by the change of outlook to which it has led. They distrust intellectual novelties, and in the recoil turn to primitive fancies. There is also, at the moment, the disturbing effect of the war which led to psychological distress without a parallel in our recent history. The war created a psychological situation in which mass-suggestion of the crudest kind was usually potent. Now, in the modern educated world, superstition is really a form of mental disease. Irrational beliefs spread by the power of suggestion which, if sufficiently strong, penetrates the barriers by which reason should prevent their entrance to the mind. Men and women, such as popular novelists, who succeed by appealing to popular fancy, are naturally sensitive to emotional currents in the community. Such yield more readily than others to unreasonable beliefs which gain popular approval, and they spread them by their writings. For the same reason

religious leaders who are similarly sensitive have their critical faculty inhibited. Without conscious intellectual dishonesty they yield to suggestion: and will make what is really an obsession the basis of elaborate argument.

Unfortunately, it is more easy to explain the spread of false emotionally-coloured ideas than to suggest a remedy. As Greco-Roman civilization showed, intellectual degeneration may conquer a whole group of peoples. But this probably happens only when the best stocks perish. Civilized progress is maintained not by the many, but by the chosen few. We must trust that Western civilization will continue to throw up an adequate number of men and women of intellectual strength sufficient to resist irrational emotion. After all, man is a reasoning animal and therefore, in the long run, reason will prevail. As the Christian would say, God is both Wisdom and Love. He has made man to think His thoughts no less than to obey His laws; and His purpose will not be frustrated.

But alike in the thought and conduct of men progress and reaction alternate. Human history and pre-history taken together justify the Christian optimism that in the long run progress is sure. But it is certainly not uniform or even approximately steady. We cannot be 'short-term' optimists. At present there is little reason to hope that English men and women in the twentieth century will show the good sense of the Victorian era now commonly despised. None the less, whatever the immediate outcome of our efforts may be, we must continue to proclaim our faith in reason, for it is only through the operation of the Divine gift of rational consciousness that we can advance in knowledge of God's works and ways. I personally believe that through such faith in reason we shall be led to accept more whole-heartedly and more intelligently than heretofore the revelation of Christ. Were it not so, I should not be speaking in this place to-day. But I cannot 'believe because it is impossible'; nor can I put the fancied welfare of any institution, secular or religious, above loyalty to truth. Your great profession is founded upon such loyalty. A determination to discover truth is the very basis of the scientific method through which medical and surgical knowledge advances. When we recall that the faculties of man, bodily, mental and spiritual, form a Divinely-planned

unity, we can affirm that the progress of medical science must serve the cause of true religion. It will be associated with an enrichment and purification of spiritual understanding: and I believe that amid all change such understanding will continue to be centred on Christ. It was He Who said that 'Wisdom is justified of all her children.'

BOOK REVIEWS

THE PROBLEM OF THE EMPTY PEW.*

Mr. S. L. Connor, a minister of the Moravian Church, shares with clergy and ministers of all Churches the disconcerting knowledge that churchgoing is on the wane. But the distinctive value of his frank and courageous book lies in this, that he knows where to look both for the cause of the trouble and for its remedy.

Thirty years experience of Northern industrial towns has convinced him that 'the problem of the empty pew is to a very large extent a theological problem.' He believes that the craze for 'the so-called popular sermon' has had its day, and that what men need and look for is 'solid teaching,' and a presentation of the gospel given in terms of twentieth-century thought, and therefore readily intelligible to the modern mind. 'We are suffering to-day from the failure of the Church in the nineteenth century to adjust her theological expression of the truth to the new mentality of a new age.'

In face of the need for restatement the preacher's task is at once absorbingly interesting and intensely difficult. 'Definite' teaching is far less easy now than formerly. The temptation to avoid awkward problems is ever present, and where the preacher lacks neither courage nor ability, he finds himself confronted by the opposition of the Traditionalist, who regards the old forms as sacrosanct, and so looks with disfavour upon all attempts at re-interpretation.

Mr. Connor is himself courageous enough to make trial of this better way, and his book offers us an interesting and to a large extent successful attempt to state frankly the meaning of Inspiration, and the true significance of the Incarnation and the Atonement. Difficulties are never burked, problems are never smothered in a mist of words, and the author writes with a passionate devotion to Christ, a devotion which leads him to wrestle with the thoughts of the New Testament till they can be given an expression which the man in the pew can assimilate and understand.

With the evils which result from a doctrine of verbal inspiration Mr. Connor is fully conversant, and he argues forcibly in defence of a more rational view. 'Verbal inspiration, which is designed to enhance the dignity and to enforce the authority of Scripture, fails lamentably to do either, and actually results in making God's Book man's slave, employed to justify his own whims and fancies, however unreasonable they may be.'

Of the Incarnation as the unveiling in a human life of the true meaning alike of the divine Fatherhood and the divine Kingship, our author has much to say that is worth saying; while his contention that the Divinity of Christ does not depend upon an acceptance of the story of the Virgin Birth is one with which the Modernist will readily agree.

* *Old Wine and New Wine-Skins.* By S. L. Connor. (J. M. Ousley & Son. 1925.) Pp. 282. 6/-.

Nearly half the book is devoted to a discussion of the Atonement. Mr. Connor shows at the outset the impossibility of discovering in the New Testament any one doctrine which can claim to be regarded as alone scriptural. And having thus cleared the ground, he proceeds to argue convincingly that every view of the Atonement must be tried and tested by our Lord's own interpretation of the divine character. Judged by this test, much that we find even in the writings of St. Paul must be set aside. And when all is said, atonement is achieved not by any change effected in the attitude of God to man, but rather by a change in the human heart wrought by a Christ who 'is the Good Physician of the sin-sick soul to-day in exactly the same sense as He was to Peter or the Magdalene during His earthly ministry.' W.M.P.

A TWENTIETH CENTURY DUPANLOUP.*

We are repeatedly asked questions about Sunday-school teaching, Bible classes, study-circles. Sometimes our correspondents seem to desire a short-cut, a philosopher's stone, a magician's wand, a back-stairs, by which they are to achieve success without effort. It is only the thorough, zealous, interested student who can become a good and influential teacher. There is *special preparation* required for each lesson, but there is something else quite as important which escapes attention. It is *general preparation*. A preparation which consists in reading the large books in one's subject and also in reading outside it altogether. These enable one to get one's background right. Busy people, tired people, lazy people ignore this continuous general preparation for their task. Hence the reservoir of knowledge they draw from becomes insipid and finally dries up, because it consists of surface-water and has no connection with the eternal springs.

With these reflections we venture to introduce Dr. Percy Dearmer's four remarkable volumes to the attention of those engaged in the practice of Christian instruction. They are volumes to be used in *special* preparation of lessons. Even those who are not engaged in teaching will find them most interesting reading. Their teaching is in the best sense Catholic and in the best sense Modernist, and above all it is never dull. The Christian religion is presented in these volumes as something essentially beautiful—'the purest treasure mortal times afford.' We hope and anticipate that they will have a very large sale. If they do not, either the intelligence of our Sunday-school and other Christian teachers, or their zeal to give good, attractive, influential teaching, is less than we have supposed.

So good a series deserves, before it passes into a second edition, to be carefully corrected. It is with such a purpose in view that we would call attention to several points. In dealing with schism, Dr. Dearmer cites as an example: 'Even in the twentieth century Christian Scientists are still cutting themselves off from all the Churches.'' We remember some years ago, when a sort of Christian Fraternal was formed to include representatives of all the Christian congregations in and around Harrogate, it was decided not to invite the Theosophists and Christian Scientists. This may have been proper or improper, but it was hardly schismatic conduct on the part of the Christian Scientists. As the attitude of the Harrogate Fraternal towards Christian Scientists is by no means exceptional, it might be better to choose some other example of modern schism.

In dealing with the Ascension, Dr. Dearmer speaks of 'the cloud' as

* *Lessons on the Way.* Four volumes. Vol. I, The Christian Covenant; Vol. II, Belief in God and in Jesus Christ. These two volumes are published by S.P.C.K. (1923), price 3/6 each. Vol. III, The Resurrection, the Spirit, and the Church. Vol. IV, The Two Duties of a Christian. These two volumes are published by Heffer's, of Cambridge (1925), price 4/- each.

though it were a mass of atmospheric moisture. Surely this is grotesque literalism. The cloud is the Shekinah, the symbol of the Divine Presence, as on the Mount of Transfiguration.

In dealing with the Trinity, Dr. Dearmer rightly warns his pupils against Tritheism. This is very important, for many English Trinitarians are Tritheists, although they would never suspect it. After this warning we are startled to find that some of Dr. Dearmer's teaching is constructive Tritheism where he makes the theological term Person the equivalent of personality. We are sure that this is a mere slip, but it ought to be corrected. Once again we would commend these excellent volumes.

H.D.A.M.

MODERNISM AS A WORKING FAITH.*

We welcome the publication of Mr. Pryke's *Modernism as a Working Faith*. Mr. Pryke writes quite definitely from the side of modernism, to which cause he has given consistent and valued support for many years while carrying on the usual work of a parish clergyman both in town and country. He is, moreover, a representative of English modernism, which, unlike the modernism which originated on the Continent within the fold of the Roman Church, realizes that Christianity as a historical religion cannot be cut away from its historical moorings without disaster. This is what is done when the Christ of religion is sharply distinguished from Jesus as He lived among men, as though this identity were not an actuality, but the creation of devotional piety. English modernism cannot accept as rational, or believe to be in the last analysis historical, estimates of Jesus which altogether fail to account for His influence on the world in the movement which resulted from His life and death.

Mr. Pryke's first chapter deals with modernism and those multitudes of ordinary people with whom it is often asserted to have no connexion, actual or possible. He denies, as his own experience entitles him to do, and indeed as it proves, that modernism is a 'barren collection of negative propositions' or an 'uneasy resting-place where a man may pause insecurely for a moment before plunging headlong down the slope of infidelity,' and maintains that the ordinary man 'is at heart potentially, if not actually and avowedly, a thorough-going modernist.' The reader will find, admirably summarized, the main principles to which modernism tries to give expression. Mr. Pryke also uses a plainness of speech which should commend itself alike to his opponents as to those who think with him. In certain cases the issues involve an apparent crudity which, though recognised, cannot be altogether avoided. Of certain well-known difficulties we read :—

> 'Jesus either had a human father or he had not; his dead body either saw corruption in the tomb or it did not; just as he either fed five thousand people with five loaves, or stilled a storm, or walked on the sea, or he did not. If he did not do these things literally, it is surely an abuse of language to assert that he did them figuratively; if in reality he was the son of Joseph and Mary, the statement that symbolically he was born of a virgin is palpable nonsense; if the tomb in fact was not empty, it is the merest playing with words to declare that symbolically it was.'

No one in his senses would dream of doubting the truth of these contentions, yet the opponents of the modernist frequently suggest that he does

* *Modernism as a Working Faith*. By the Rev. W. M. Pryke, B.D., Rector of Risby. (Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons, Ltd., 1925. Price 4/6 net.)

make the kind of claims ridiculed in the quotation. Mr. Pryke makes it clear that the modernist, while not in the least wishing to force dogmatic denials on others, does claim at least the right to suspend his judgement on matters which a legitimate literary and historical criticism has rendered doubtful; but he feels withal that by so doing he in no wise injures religion, his own or other people's; that belief in the Virgin Birth of Jesus is not essential to belief in the Incarnation, nor belief in the empty tomb essential to the faith that death had and has no more dominion over Him. In doctrines connected with history the modernist claims to distinguish between fact and mode, and to believe that no one mode is essential to belief in the fact of which it is the expression. It may be worth while to add, just for once, that this distinction between fact and mode does not suppose that there was an historical Incarnation without some mode which is the true one, as against others which are not true; the modernist does not imagine an Incarnation the fact of which could be independent of one or of every other possible mode; he is not blind to the fact that, whatever reality may be allowed to history, it is certainly not the variety which makes no appearance.

The chapters which follow deal with such generally important matters as the effect and the implications of the higher criticism upon the teaching of the Bible to the children and of the idea of God which should be given to the young. Throughout the discussion is practical as well as theoretical. In a chapter on New Testament criticism, which Mr. Pryke insists must be free and thoroughgoing, he is very clearly conscious of the seriousness of the task. 'It is no light thing to be thought to undermine deliberately the faith in which a man may have lived and worked for half a life-time.' Even on the brighter side the usefulness of criticism is not unlimited, for 'the inner significance of Christianity as a living power can in the last resort reveal itself only to those in whose lives and actions the spirit of Christ receives visible expression.' But Mr. Pryke will not allow that the free use of criticism need impair the richness of devotion. Even in cases where there seems to be loss rather than gain, and we have to confess uncertainty of the genuineness of this or that valued saying, it yet remains as evidence of what the earliest generations of Christians thought of the mind that was in Christ Jesus, evidence of a kind which is often insufficiently weighed and appreciated, and which no criticism can take away. As Mr. Pryke says in another chapter with reference to the Virgin Birth story, we may say that modernist and conservative alike must recognise the greatness of Jesus which the presence of such sayings involves, and also the challenge to a personal decision for or against the claims of Christ by which we are all confronted. His claim 'to the control of human life—individual, social, international—is not one that permits an attitude of nicely-poised neutrality.'

Mr. Pryke's' paper on 'Jesus and the Eucharist' is an admirably concise exposition of a difficult subject. It takes the form of a well justified criticism of the statement of the Anglican Episcopate that 'the whole-hearted acceptance of the divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion' must be part of the essential basis for re-union—a statement which would seem to have regard rather to the present and largely uncritical opinion prevailing in the numerically strongest churches than to what may be stated with reasonable historical certainty. The differences in the evangelical record are set out clearly but without exaggeration, and Mr. Pryke calls attention to the fact that if, with Westcott and Hort, the second half of verse 19 and the whole of verse 20 be omitted from *Luke*

xxii, there disappears 'all reference to a connexion between the wine and the blood of Jesus, all reference to a repetition of the rite, and all real similarity between the versions of Luke and Paul.' The critical examination of the relevant texts is accompanied by a reverent attempt to show the meaning of the Last Supper as celebrated in the upper room by Jesus while yet in the flesh, though we do not like the phrase on p. 195 (or Dr. Orchard's form of it quoted on p. 190), that Jesus 'pledged his disciples in the toast of the Kingdom.' In the light of how little can be asserted with confidence as to what happened on that fateful evening, or about the mind of Jesus regarding any future performance of the rite, it is not difficult to understand that Mr. Pryke can scarcely look with patience 'upon the attitude of those Anglicans who would question the validity of the sacraments of the Free Churches.'

We wish space would allow of a fuller account of Mr. Pryke's pages. They might well be read with profit by those who cannot devote the time to technical books, as a preparation for the coming Conference. If occasionally in following Mr. Pryke's pages we have felt that he has been 'up against' the less reasonable presentations of traditional Christianity, we are sure that he judges these by the standards by which he would wish his own work to be judged. We hope his book will be widely read.

J.S.B.

SCHWEITZER'S SOUVENIRS.*

The publishers say of this work: 'In these sketches Dr. Schweitzer describes in his usual direct and graphic style those events and experiences in his childhood and youth which he regards as of particular significance in their effect on his spiritual growth and development. He traces the steps by which the artist and philosopher became a doctor in the primeval forest. The book written with much humour and charm, and at the same time profound depth, is one that will appeal to old and young alike.'

We can cordially endorse this verdict and assure everyone of a most entrancing evening who begins to read it. We say 'begins' advisedly, for it is very improbable that any reader will put the book down until he has read it through to the last page.

This little volume of reminiscences is really invaluable. The author reveals himself in its pages as few others, even in two volume autobiographies, succeed in doing. We learn to love and admire Schweitzer the man and to feel something of the tremendous influence his pure sincerity and white hot zeal for righteousness exert. The book is especially valuable psychologically, for it is written by one well versed in this science, who brings to bear on his self-analysis a wide knowledge of this and other subjects. Nevertheless it is far removed from a 'learned book' and is written throughout in a simple, unaffected style, quietly humorous yet thoroughly in earnest at one and the same time. The following extract well illustrates all these points:—

> 'My first recollection is of seeing the devil. As soon as I was three or four years old I was allowed to go to church every Sunday, and I used to look forward to this the whole week through. And now every Sunday I noticed in a bright frame by the side of the organ a shaggy face which was continually turning about and looking down into the church. So long as the organ was playing and the singing going on

* *Memoirs of Childhood and Youth.* By Albert Schweitzer, Dr. Theol., Dr. Med., Dr. Phil. (London: George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 1924. Price 3/6 net.)

it was visible, but as soon as my father was praying at the altar it disappeared. When the playing and singing began again it reappeared, but as soon as my father began his sermon it was again lost to sight, to show itself once more for the closing hymn and voluntary. "This is the devil that is looking down into the church," I said to myself; "but as soon as father begins God's Word he has to make himself scarce." This weekly dose of visible theology gave quite a distinctive turn to my childish piety. It was only much later that I understood that the face that came and disappeared so strangely was that of Daddy Iltis, the organist' (p. 9).

Notwithstanding his exaltation of reason earlier in the book (*e.g.* on age 60), where he writes: 'But I was convinced—and I am so still—that he fundamental principles of Christianity have to be proved true by easoning, and by no other method'—Schweitzer is at the same time a real ıystic. He says:—

'The great secret of success is to go through life as a man that never gets used up. That is possible for him who never argues with men and facts, but in all experiences retires into himself, and looks for the ultimate cause of things within himself' (p. 101).

So it is that he is enabled to rise to the sublime height of his last few aragraphs.

'All ordinary violence produces its own limitations, for it calls forth an answering violence which sooner or later becomes its equal or its superior. But kindness works simply and perseveringly; it produces no strained relations which prejudice its working; strained relations which already exist it relaxes. Hence it is the furthest reaching and most effective of all forces.

All the kindness which a man puts out into the world works on the heart and thoughts of mankind, but we are so foolishly indifferent that we are never in earnest in the matter of kindness. We want to topple a great load over, and yet will not avail ourselves of a lever which would multiply our power a hundred-fold.

There is an unmeasured depth of truth in that strange saying of Jesus: "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth" (St. Matt. v, 5)' (p. 103).

These words from the lips of such a man—one who has given so much the cause of humanity in so many directions—are robbed of the suspicion f cant which otherwise might attach to them and fitly close this most imulating and helpful little book. J.D.C.

THE LITURGY IN ROME.*

This handbook to Christian and Ecclesiastical Rome may be described s an ecclesiastical Baedeker for English-speaking visitors to the Eternal ity, to whom it should be as indispensable as its prototype. Much light as been thrown by recent discoveries and research upon most of the subcts touched; but the results of this, being hidden away in larger volumes, e not easily accessible: a guide book on those lines, historical and deriptive, meets a real want. The work will be also useful to Anglo-atholics desirous of approximating their services to Roman models, and general to those whose tastes run in the direction of ritual and liturgy. ore attention has been paid of late years to Primitive than to Patristic hristianity; where Bingham and Wheatley have one reader, Harnack and

* *The Liturgy in Rome.* By M. A. R. Tuker. (A. & C. Black, Ltd., 1925. Price 7/6.)

Duchesne have ten. But, though 'liturgies were not composed till the fourth century,' it is impossible to understand the uses of to-day without a certain acquaintance with their origins; and among the features of Miss Tuker's book which deserve special attention may be mentioned a synopsis of early liturgies arranged in tabular form, and carefully written notes on the penitential system, the agape, the *disciplina arcani,* the Epiklesis and the consecration.

The section on 'the term *Catholic* applied to the Christian Church' deserves notice:

> 'Optatus shews that the Christian Church in the face of the Donatists held its guarantee in its catholicity, but long before this, when the creed was yet vague, and formed a looser tie than that of a common ideal and practice, the guarantee was unity. Vincent of Lerins notices that it is the Catholic Church itself which makes this unity, not the special beliefs realised at any one period. . . . The great Eastern Church neither calls itself, nor claims to be, 'catholic'; the only Church which claims to be "the Catholic," and the one Catholic, Church, is the Catholic Church in communion with Rome.'

A certain asperity which does not properly belong to it has been imported into this question by the assumption that 'Catholic' is a title of honour, and 'Protestant' a term of reproach. But this is a matter of opinion; many hold the reverse view. And, be this as it may, value-judgments are irrelevant; the question is one of the meaning of the word. The way in which the term 'Catholic' is commonly used to-day to denote certain sacramental beliefs and practices is unhistorical. It was originally a political, a theological appellation; the reference being not to the Papacy, which was a later growth, but to Rome as the seat of Universal Empire and the centre of the civilised world.

In the present *Anno Santo* the account given of the Jubilee is of interest:—

> 'The Jubilee was an extension of the theory of indulgences. By the ninth century the penitential system was practically exchanged for a system of indulgences, remissions of penalty purchased by alms, and later by a crusade. To the latter the first regular indulgence was attached; Alzog tells us that it was the quantity of these, and of the indulgences attached to the building of St. Peter's, which ruined the penitential system of the Church. In 1225 Alexander IV offered a full indulgence, *plenissimam peccatorum remissionem,* to all who took the cross against his enemy, Manfred.'

The word *peccatorum* should be noticed, and also the extension of the crusaders' privilege, originally the reward of the champions of Christendom against the Turks, to the defenders of the Pope's personal policy.

> 'In 1300 Boniface VIII announced the first jubilee year. It was only to occur once in a century. Clement VI, however, reduced the interval to fifty years, Urban VI to thirty-three, and Paul IV (in 1450) to twenty-five years; and this it remains to-day.' A.F.

THE REAL JESUS.

Whatever we may think of its conclusions, the interest and charm of this seventh volume of the Modern Churchman's Library are beyond question. Dr. Major in studying St. Mark's Gospel has fallen in love with his subject, and in consequence writes with an enthusiasm and force

* *Jesus by an Eye-Witness*, by H. D. A. Major, D.D. John Murray, 1925. Price 3s. 6d.

which delight the reader. Yet this very enthusiasm appears at times to have given to his work the character of a brief for the defence, albeit a brief compiled by one wholly assured of the justice of the case he pleads. Dr. Major expresses himself as 'convinced of the very primitive and archaic character of this Gospel,' and has no doubt that it 'enshrines the reminiscences of St. Peter, delivered orally in Aramaic but translated into Greek by St. Mark and transcribed by him.'

Does he prove his case? That is a question which every reader must decide for himself, and without doubt the task of weighing the evidence adduced will prove a fascinating occupation even for those to whom the problems of New Testament criticism are new ground. For the book has been written not for the expert but for educated readers in general, and throughout the exposition is so clear that no one should find it difficult to appreciate the many points of interest which are offered for consideration.

An opening chapter summarises the evidence from Papias to Origen in favour of the Marcan authorship of the Gospel and its dependence on the memoirs of Peter. Some will feel that Papias's statement receives too ready an assent, and that there is a certain tendency in later parts of the book to accept only such portions of that evidence as serve to support the hypothesis which the author defends. Professor Loofs, for example, one of Germany's foremost scholars, whose position as a whole is conservative, suggests that Papias's statement about Mark's dependence on Peter may be of no more value than the remark of Irenaeus that Luke wrote down the gospel preached by Paul.

However, if Papias be regarded as trustworthy, there can be no doubt that Dr. Major, by a close examination of the internal evidence of the Gospel, makes out a most interesting, and as it will appear to many, convincing case for his reminiscences of an eye-witness.

Dr. Major is undoubtedly right in emphasising the relatively primitive character of the Marcan Christology as against that of Matthew and Luke. But is Mark's Christology quite as primitive as our author supposes? And is it really altogether identical with that of Acts I to XII? True, in Mark our Lord first becomes conscious of his Messiahship at the moment of Baptism. But are there not traces in Acts of a still earlier belief which regards Jesus, the doer of mighty works, as declared to be Messiah not at his Baptism, but by the Resurrection?

Similarly, some critics would maintain that the five stages in which the Messiahship of Jesus is unveiled—stages which Dr. Major claims to detect in Mark despite the express testimony of Papias that any kind of chronological order is not to be looked for in the second Gospel—are only discoverable by the exercise of what has been termed 'unjustifiable sharpwightedness.' The testimony of the demoniacs to Jesus long ago aroused the suspicion of William Wrede, who believed that Jesus was not thought of as Messiah until after the Resurrection. And Dr. Major's apparent acceptance of the detailed predictions of the Passion which Mark puts into the mouth of Jesus is somewhat surprising, since the presence of these predictions at least suggests the possibility that Mark's is not quite 'the plain, unvarnished tale' which we are asked to suppose.

So again with the well marked stages in the teaching of Jesus to which Dr. Major calls attention. His division of the teaching into four stages—Popular, Parabolic, Pastoral and Passion, is suggestive and interesting, but, we must needs think, over-ingenious. Is it really the case

that our Lord never told stories to illustrate his popular teaching? And whence the supposition that Jesus quickly gave up teaching the crowds, or that he 'fled from Galilee'? Of all this the Synoptics tell us nothing. And in point of fact the crowds are enthusiastic till the end, and are systematically taught in the Temple even in Jerusalem itself.

Dr. Major makes a good point in asserting that whereas the teaching of Jesus which Mark records arises directly out of the situation, Matthew tends to group sayings according to subject, while Luke's attempt to create an artificial context is evidence of a stage later even than that of Matthew. But when he would have us regard the eschatological discourse in Mark xiii as secondary on the ground that it was delivered in private, he is surely using an argument which can be turned against himself, since the detailed predictions of the Passion, which Dr. Major accepts, will then fall under a like suspicion.

In setting forth the use which Matthew and Luke have made of the more primitive Mark, Dr. Major is admirable and altogether convincing. He points out the tendency manifest in the later Gospels to heighten the miraculous, to remove difficulties which Mark's directness of speech might well occasion, to present the disciples in a less unfavourable light, and to substitute a more exact terminology for the popular speech of the second Gospel. Here the case for the relative priority of Mark is overwhelming.

When Dr. Major compares the synoptic narratives with the object of finding in Mark traces of his eye-witness, Peter, he is able to show in many instances a greater vividness of detail in the earlier account. But when his desire to stress the primitive character of Mark leads him to deny to the second Gospel any considerable use of the argument from prophecy, we can only feel that the denial is unwarranted by the facts. Not only does Mark record repeated predictions of the Passion, but his whole story of the crucifixion is saturated with Old Testament reminiscences, all of which, even when a definite connection between prediction and fulfilment is not actually made, would seem to be evidence of an apologetic tendency.

We may say, therefore, that while Mark is relatively primitive both in his Christology, his treatment of the miraculous, his presentation of the teaching of Jesus, his disconcerting bluntness of speech, and even in his comparatively restrained use of the Proof from Scripture, it must still remain doubtful whether his narrative is in reality as simple and archaic as Dr. Major supposes.

And yet undeniably the case for the presence in Mark of certain vivid touches which may seem to betray the influence of an eye-witness is forcibly presented. Naturally the evidence will appeal differently to different persons, or even to the same person in different moods. And the reviewer's position is not unlike that of King Agrippa when confronted with the arguments of Paul. Sometimes, with the half-converted monarch of the A.V., he is ready to reply, 'Almost thou persuadest me'! And then again the sceptic of the R.V. is at his elbow, whispering, 'With but little persuasion thou wouldst fain make me a convert.' And on the whole perhaps the sceptic has it!

For, surprising as it may appear to the readers of the *Church Times*, Dr. Major's position is, after all, somewhat markedly conservative, and in this most interesting study of the earliest Gospel he comes before us as the able champion of views which, in some cases at least, a more radical criticism will hesitate to accept.

W. M. PRYKE.